

PUSEYISM UNMASKED.

SKETCHES FOR THE TIMES.

[Grant Jones]

BY THE AUTHOR OF

“GOD IS LOVE,” “BAPTISM, A TRACT FOR THE TIMES,”

&c. &c.

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. AND YE ARE COMPLETE IN HIM.”

Col. II 8-10.

LONDON:

JAMES NISBET AND CO. BERNERS STREET.

MDCCCXLI.

Price Two Shillings.



CONTENTS.

PART I.

	PAGE
THE GROUNDS OF OPPOSITION TO PUSEYISM. <i>They are not trivial and unimportant, but involve Fundamental Truth</i> - - -	1
PUSEYITE ESTIMATE of <i>The Articles, The Reformers, and The Reformation</i> - - - - -	3
APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION as an <i>Article of Faith</i> - - - -	7
TRADITION as the <i>Interpreter of Scripture</i> - - - - -	11
PASSAGES ON ROMANISM, including <i>Purgatory, Prayer for the Dead, Invocation of Saints, &c.</i> - - - - -	21

PART II.

PUSEYITE PRINCIPLE OF RESERVE in communicating Religious Knowledge. <i>The practical Effect of this Principle to VEIL THE TRUTH IN MYSTERY</i> - - - - -	30
FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRINCIPLE OF RESERVE, as regards the <i>Preaching of the ATONEMENT</i> - - - - -	40
JUSTIFICATION as explained by <i>Scripture and the Church of England</i> OPPOSED TO PUSEYISM - - - - -	46
THE CONNECTION OF VARIOUS OPPOSING SECTS AND HERESIES -	67

P R E F A C E.

THE following Sketches of Puseyism have one simple object in view—that of exhibiting the real character of the doctrine commonly known under this designation, and of identifying it, modified by various peculiarities, with that natural religion of the heart of fallen man, alike opposed to the spirituality and self-renunciation required on the Gospel plan of salvation, and to the doctrines of the Church of England as grounded on that Revelation. The extracts given in these pages from the Puseyite writers, have been so selected as not to detach passages, of which the context fairly bears a different meaning; and such only are quoted as can scarcely fail to carry with them their own condemnation. The introduction has been carefully avoided of any of those specimens, unhappily too frequent, of covert and artful insinuation, of insidious reasoning, and of sophistries, which the hasty or careless reader might not at once unravel. It may be asked whether the study of these writers be generally necessary, to become aware of the effects of their errors, when those errors are plainly pointed out? Do we judge it necessary or expedient *to take poison in order to know its effects*? We are willing, in such a case, to be satisfied with being taught by the experience of others. We are never safe in running *needlessly* into danger. We have no warrant so to expose ourselves to temptation and delusion, and no promise that in so acting, we shall be preserved unharmed. To try our strength in the subtleties of controversial discussion, from motives of curiosity, an unsettled temper of mind, or in self-confidence, is dangerously sporting with deadly weapons. To be safe or profitable, it must, in any case, be a deeply serious and prayerful examination, and a matter of plain and imperative duty.

On one point the writer is anxious not to be misunderstood. No *term* is employed in the following pages, except to characterize *a system*, and as a means of doing so intelligibly, without having recourse to circumlocution. *To the system* also, strictly, is any expression of hostile feeling confined. And this strong feeling of decided opposition has been the result of careful investigation, and derived from an acquaintance with the writings delineating this theory, from the time of the first systematic efforts for its propagation, in the commencement of the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," now about seven years ago. The writer fully believes that there are many individuals, superior to their system, failing clearly to apprehend its evils, and themselves deceived by it; and such may be startled, to find themselves called upon to admit, as the sentiments of their party, statements drawn from these writings, which shock their better feelings, and in which they dare not coincide. May the fearful tendency and anti-scriptural nature of the creed here laid open to their view prove a timely warning. May others also be deterred from rushing into the same snare. And lastly, may every reader seriously reflect, that a mere acquiescence of the judgment, in any creed, however scriptural, is not religion. Freedom from error, therefore, in regard to that nominal belief, will not secure our eternal safety. It is the religion of the heart, the faith of the Gospel, carried out into the life, which alone can avail. "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by *faith of Jesus Christ* might be given to them that believe." "*Who of God is made unto us, wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.*" And in each heart thus receiving the Saviour, the prevailing desire will be, in the strength of the Holy Ghost, to "WALK WORTHY OF THE LORD UNTO ALL PLEASING, BEING FRUITFUL IN EVERY GOOD WORK."

PUSEYISM UNMASKED.

SKETCHES FOR THE TIMES.

PART I.

THE GROUNDS OF OPPOSITION TO PUSEYISM NOT TRIVIAL AND UNIMPORTANT, BUT INVOLVING FUNDAMENTAL TRUTH.—PUSEYITE ESTIMATE OF THE ARTICLES, THE REFORMERS, AND THE REFORMATION.—APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION AS AN ARTICLE OF FAITH.—TRADITION AS THE INTERPRETER OF SCRIPTURE.—PASSAGES ON ROMANISM, INCLUDING PURGATORY, PRAYER FOR THE DEAD, INVOCATION OF SAINTS, &c.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND having been so boldly assailed by the Puseyite party, while yet professing to belong to that church, no apology is required for pointing out the undisguised *Anti-protestantism* contained in their writings—the *Ecclesiastical tyranny* resulting from their principles—and the *entire opposition of their favourite dogmas to those of the Church of England*, and, by consequence, to *Scripture*, that being the standard of appeal acknowledged by our Church.

The principles and pretensions of the authors of the "*Tracts for the Times*," have latterly assumed a character of development which imperatively demands their examination. Notwithstanding it may be true that the

abstract style, and general dulness of many of these Puseyite compositions, will preclude their being extensively read, yet investigation and refutation of their principles are requisite, from their insidious and dangerous statements, from the increased activity of their agents, and because of the various modes now adopted for the diffusion of their pernicious opinions. In addition to the separate and more independent works; from the Review and the Magazine under their patronage, to the cautiously-worded occasional article, unwarily gaining access into other publications; from the editorial preface, or the notes appended to a reprint, or biographical sketch, to the ‘Village Tale,’ or Children’s Story Book; from the pulpit effort, to the more private intercourse of the social circle; no means are left unemployed to disseminate these mischievous doctrines; *just so much* on each occasion being developed, as the audience or the readers are supposed *prepared to receive*, this wily principle of “Reserve” governing every other, with a constancy and perseverance worthy even of Ignatius Loyola and his followers. The display of learning assumed by some of these authors, renders them only more capable of investing error with gayer colouring, and what is false will never more readily pass current, than when made plausible by men of talent and ingenuity.

It is the object of the following pages to show that THE GROUNDS OF OPPOSITION TO PUSEYISM ARE NOT TRIVIAL AND INSUFFICIENT.

We do not contend for trifles, when we find the *paramount authority* of Scripture denied, and Tradition exalted as its *Interpreter*, thus subjecting the Word of God to the decisions of men, and presumptuously disregarding the denunciation of our Lord, “In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” *We are not contending for trifles*, when “another gospel, which is not another,” is preached, and justification is made to depend, in part at least, upon the obedience—the merit in other words, and the

worthiness of man ; the very foundation of the Gospel plan of salvation by grace, being thus overthrown. *It is not for trifles we dispute*, when it is sought to prohibit the proclamation of the Gospel ; to keep back the declaration of the atonement of Christ for the salvation of sinners, on the miserable pretext that the theme is too lofty and too mysterious, to render its universal promulgation consistent with due reverence. O the impious folly of acting in direct opposition to the command of God, with the wretched profession on our lips of religious deference and awe ! Are we better judges than God, of the mode in which our reverence for the mysteries of redemption shall be shown ? Shall we *dare* to disobey the solemn command to “ *preach the Gospel to every creature*,” with the hypocritical plea in our mouths, and the wicked presumption in our hearts, of assuming that we have more reverence for God than he claims for his own perfections, and that we have a right to conceal from our fellow sinners, that amazing display of those perfections, as exerted for our redemption, which it has pleased Him of infinite mercy to make known as his “ GIFT ” — “ *Eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord*.” Shall we incur the deep responsibility of thus treating the heavenly message of “ *peace on earth, and good will to men* ? ” We do so treat this revelation, by joining with those *who refuse to proclaim without reserve*, the only “ *name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved* ; ” and we are partakers of their criminality, when we think, or speak lightly, of this guilty betrayal of the immortal interests of our fellow creatures.

PUSEYITE ESTIMATE OF THE ARTICLES, THE
REFORMERS, AND THE REFORMATION.

As we proceed in the investigation of the doctrines, advocated by the authors of the “ *Tracts for the Times*,”

and their associates, various other oppositions to Scripture, and the Church of England, (of which they yet profess to be members,) will appear. In the mean time, let us examine how far the charge of *heresy* is justly alleged against these writers. What then is heresy? If it be to hold opinions ‘contrary to some Article of *the Faith*, or something which, by necessary consequence, leads to the subversion of some fundamental truth.’—If this definition be correct; if opinions condemned alike by Scripture, and by our Articles and Formularies, be heresy, then the authors in question are clearly amenable to this charge, if it be shown that the foregoing statements are substantiated by their writings.

But first, *and as indicating their own suspicion, of the difficulty of reconciling their sentiments WITH THE ARTICLES*, the attempt to set aside their authority must be noticed. The 71st ‘Tract for the Times,’ represents the

“Settlement of religion at the Reformation as incomplete and defective.”

Then states the Articles to be

“Scarcely more than protests against specific existing errors of the sixteenth century, and neither being, nor professing to be, a system of doctrine.”

It is added, that

“They have practically superseded previous Catholic teaching altogether, which they were but modifying in parts.”

It is admitted in this Tract (though not in some other writings of the same class,) that nothing can be pointed out in the English Church, which is not true *as far as it goes*, and that the complaint is of “omissions;” and with this specious subterfuge, do the “Tractarians” defend themselves, when they advocate the superstitious observances of antiquity, and a servile submission to the decisions and practices of a corrupted age of the church.

On this plea of omission do they depend, as sufficient to shield them in all their manifest discrepancies from the doctrine of the Church of England. Standing plainly in need of some plausible device for escaping from their inconsistencies, it will scarcely be denied, that if a somewhat ingenious, it is at least a deceptive and unworthy evasion.

But again, *are these Articles* ‘mere protests against some existing errors?’ Why these writers desire to assume that they do not ‘profess to be a *system of doctrine*,’ has been seen, but they were “agreed upon in the Convocation of 1562, *for the avoiding of diversities of opinions*, and for the *establishing of consent* touching true religion.” They are put forth as “*containing the true doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God’s Word*.”* The question now before us does not include the argument for the scriptural character of these Articles. It is simply this:—Can those claim to be Churchmen who oppose their “true, usual, and literal meaning,” as “*the doctrine of the Church*,” by adding to them those figments of antiquity rejected by that church? Granting for a moment, for the sake of argument, that the Articles were protests merely against Romish errors, what is the result? Why that not according in their statements with these protests, the Tractarians are no more Churchmen than before.

The disparaging language used respecting THE REFORMERS OF OUR CHURCH, AND THE REFORMATION, further illustrates the *Anti-Protestant* nature of the Puseyite principles. One of the party, after much general condemnation of the Reformers, ends by wishing “*to have nothing to do with such a set*,” a judgment formally defended by his Editors,† who also inform us that their sentiments differ materially from those of our Reformers, “About sacramental grace, especially in the holy Eucharist, about the power of the keys, Apostolical Succession,” &c.

* ‘Declaration’ prefixed to the Articles.

† See Preface to the Second Part of Froude’s Remains.

And they add—

“ Compare the sayings and manner of the two schools, (namely the Reformers, and the Fathers of the fourth century,) on the subjects of fasting, celibacy, religious vows, voluntary retirement, and contemplation, the memory of the saints, rites and ceremonies recommended by antiquity... and especially on the great point of giving men divine knowledge... not indiscriminately, but as men are able to bear it, there can be little doubt that, generally speaking, *the tone of the fourth century is so unlike that of the sixteenth*, that it is absolutely impossible for the same mind to sympathize with both. *You must choose between the two lines ; they are not only diverging, but contrary.*”

Yes, we have to thank God, that our scriptural Reformers appealed to the Bible as their standard, and could not therefore but adopt *a tone in the sixteenth century*, unlike that of the corruptions of the fourth. Ecclesiastical history affords convincing proof of the numerous unscriptural addenda, which had gradually been adopted, as the practice of the Church at that period, and to this bondage of superstition, to these puerilities, and vain traditions, would the Puseyites of the present day bring us back. Let their words be marked. Formerly a disguise of deference towards the Reformers was assumed—an attempt was made to show, that the Reformers and the Articles did not contradict Puseyism; now the mask is boldly thrown aside, and we are told that we *must “ choose between the two lines ;”* the tone of the fourth century *is so unlike that of the Reformation*, that the lines *“ are not only diverging but contrary.”* Need proof be added to this voluntary confession, on the part of some of the leaders of this new sect, that their doctrines and views are not those of the Reformation, and by consequence, *not those of the Church to which they treacherously profess to belong?* Did space permit, however, multiplied testimonies might be adduced, of the depreciating and disrespectful tone of these oppositionists on the subject, but brevity having been a very principal

object in these Sketches, it has been as far as possible consulted, in limiting the quotations to those indispensably requisite.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, AS AN ARTICLE OF FAITH.

The undue and semi-popish exaltation of the power and dignity of the Episcopal and Ministerial Offices, being one grand object and perpetual effort of the Tractarians, it becomes necessary here to produce evidence of the differing sentiments of the Reformers of our Church. *In this view, and in fact comprising the rest*, APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION is most strongly and continually insisted upon by the Puseyite party, lamenting that the Church of England does not make it *an article of Faith*, regretting

“the omission of any direct safeguard in the Articles against the disbelief of the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession.”

They are comforted however in some degree, by reflecting as before, that

“the *omissions*, or rather obscurities of Anglican doctrine, may be supplied for the most part by each of us for himself.”*

Our Reformers wisely and piously judged the stability of the Church to rest only in adherence to Scripture. They did not therefore require a belief in Apostolical Succession as *an article of Faith*—a thing necessary to salvation, because they did not find it so placed in the New Testament. They there found that the Church was to be built upon Christ, the Rock of Ages, and so they left it, with ample scope allowed for private judgment on minor matters. As expressed by the 20th Article, “although the Church be a witness and keeper of holy writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, *so besides the same* ought it not to enforce anything to be believed *for necessity of salvation*.” That deeply learned defender of the Church of England, Bishop Jewell,

* Tract 71, page 32.

remarks on this subject, “ If it were certain that *the religion and truth of God* passeth evermore orderly *by succession and none otherwise*, then were succession a very good substantial argument of the truth. But Christ saith, (‘ by order of succession) the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ chaire.’ Annas and Caiaphas, touching *succession*, were as well bishops as Aaron and Eleazar. God’s grace is promised unto a good mind, and to any one that feareth him ; not unto Sees and Successions If so be the place and consecration only be sufficient, why then Manasses succeeded David, and Caiaphas succeeded Aaron. And it hath been often seen, that an idol hath been placed in the Temple of God.” The grand care of our Reformers was, that the Church of England should have the marks of a true Church, as to being scriptural in doctrine, and in requiring this in her ministers carried out into their preaching and practice. It is not therefore Apostolical Succession by which the Church is defined, but the 19th Article declares “ *the visible Church of Christ to be a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached*, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ’s ordinance.” And in accordance with this, Bishop Jewell, in his famous Defence of the Apology for the Church of England, thus speaks. “ Lawful succession standeth not only in possession of place, *but also and much rather* in doctrine and diligence.” And again, “ for that ye tell us so many faire tales of Peter’s succession, we demand of you, wherein the Pope succeedeth Peter ? Ye answer, in his Chaire, as if Peter had been sometime installed in Rome, and had sate with his triple crown in a chaire of gold. And then, having lost both religion and doctrine, ye think it sufficient at least to hold by the chaire, as if a soldier that had lost his sword would play the man with the scabbard. But so Caiaphas succeeded Aaron ; so may Antichrist easily sit in Peter’s chaire.”*

* One of the Puseyite writers, compelled to admit that Apostolical Succession is not clearly taught in Scripture, asserts that *the Godhead of*

To those who do not hold a belief in Apostolical Succession, to be of *absolute and indispensable necessity*, and are willing to admit therefore that a difference of opinion *may* exist on this point, it has been unfairly objected, that by this admission they make the Institution of the Ministerial charge to be of man and not of God. Now the foundation and origin of the ministerial office is assuredly of God—the preaching of the Gospel, and the ordinances of religion, are his merciful and appointed provision for the spiritual need of man; but that there were to be ministers in the Christian Church, does not prove that ministers at the present day, are such by an unbroken Apostolical Succession. Those who doubt the absolute necessity of this belief, or doubt the historical proof, may yet hold a commission to ministers *by divine authority*, and they do so on the ground of a New Testament ap-

the Holy Ghost is nowhere so taught, and that *consistency* would oblige the rejection of both doctrines if either—that they must both stand or fall together, if clear Scripture proof be demanded.* Surely the falsehood of this assertion scarcely needs remark, but a passage from the Homily for Whitsunday, may serve to show *Tractarian consistency* with Church of England doctrine. That “the Holy Ghost is the third Person in the Deity, distinct from the Father and the Son, and yet proceeding from them both, *may be easily proved by most plain testimonies of God’s holy word*. No man possibly *can doubt thereof unless he will blaspheme the everlasting truth of God’s Word*.”

The author of this most objectionable Tract, proceeds in the same strain to *assume*, that of other important doctrines, Justification by Faith, Original Sin, the Atonement, &c. nearly the same thing may be said as to there *being little about them in Scripture!* and asks especially whether any “*Church doctrine*,” as it is termed, “about the *power of Absolution*, the *Christian Priesthood* [meaning Succession, and the *Sacrifice* of the Eucharist] or the danger of *Sin after Baptism*, is so disadvantageously circumstanced in point of evidence, as Justification by Faith only.”† To what unhallowed and dangerous positions will men resort in defence of a favourite theory, unscrupulously attempting in its behalf to shake the evidences of Christian faith, but which, let us thank God, are too clear and decisive to be affected by sophistry.

* Tract 85, p. 4.

† Tract 85, p. 12.

pointment. In other words, that the christian ministry is of divine authority, does not *necessarily* include *the further proposition*, that the ordination of ministers at the present day is derivable from apostolic times, in indisputable regularity, without one flaw or link in the chain wanting in any single instance, for eighteen hundred years. Bishop Hall, in his celebrated treatise, ‘Episcopacy by Divine Right,’ leaves this point entirely out of the question, and wisely places the argument for episcopal authority on Scripture ground. Let those who are themselves satisfied with the evidence, hold the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, but without *perverting* it to the object of unscripturally magnifying the spiritual power of the clergy in popish guise, as respects absolution, the Sacraments, &c. thus re-introducing those Romish principles of *ecclesiastical tyranny* banished at the Reformation.* Nor yet let it be demanded that the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession be made *an Article of Faith*, thereby insisting upon *an addition to the Articles of the Church of England*, and fearfully approaching to suspending the very existence of the Church of Christ, not upon the testimony of Scrip-

* The 85th Tract for the Times, among many others, holds very unjustifiable language on this subject of priestly power and authority. And speaking of the miracles worked of old by the Prophets, adds, “*and if baptism be the cleansing and quickening of the dead soul, to say nothing of the Lord’s Supper, they (ministers) do work miracles.*”† Comment upon this arrogant assumption of a power belonging to God alone, would be superfluous. It is the same feeling which induces the support of the doctrine of a ‘real presence,’ in the Lord’s Supper, *in a form so nearly resembling* transubstantiation, that its advocates admit that the distinction cannot well be defined in words, and that *explanation might infringe on reverence*. It follows that the holy Eucharist is again, as in former corruptions of the doctrine, to be looked upon as *a sacrifice and oblation*, and the Priest as offering it. A *real spiritual presence* in this holy Sacrament, “The body of Christ, given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner,”‡ is the doctrine of our Reformed Church; but if there be meaning in language, such a construction as this cannot be put upon the words of this Tract.§

† Tract 85, p. 95. ‡ 28th Article. § Tract 85, p. 97.

ture, (as ‘built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone’) but upon an intricate historical question of doubtful proof, not required in Scripture to be believed at all, and one of those things therefore, having, according to our 21st Article, “neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that it be taken out of Holy Scripture.”*

TRADITION, AS THE INTERPRETER OF SCRIPTURE.

“TO THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY; IF THEY SPEAK NOT ACCORDING TO THIS WORD, IT IS BECAUSE THERE IS NO LIGHT IN THEM.” ISA. VIII. 20.

In making appeal to the Bible, *the different language used by the Puseyite writers, and by our Church, must be remarked.* According to the former, equally with the Romanist, TRADITION IS THE INTERPRETER OF SCRIPTURE; but according to the Church of England, “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that *whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby,* is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed *as an Article of the Faith,* or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.”† If, therefore, leaving this principle of the *sufficiency* of Scripture to teach all saving truth, we admit that we are to receive it *as interpreted by the Church,* we do not believe it at all, *in the sense* of the article just quoted, for the decisions of the Church, and the voice of antiquity, are of no weight here, and are

* It may perhaps be permitted to illustrate the distinction here advocated, by a parallel case. It is equally by *divine authority* that we honour kings, and yield submission to temporal rulers, for “there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God,” whether civil or ecclesiastical; but we do not consequently require that the titles of our kings and rulers, be proved by unbroken succession from the days when the command was given, in any other sense than that there always have been rulers, to whom subjection was due by divine command.

† Article VI.

only estimated *so far as they are contained in Scripture, or may be proved thereby.*

It has been said, that we receive the Creeds as handed down to us by Tradition, and that our Church therefore admits its authority. “*We take,*” say the Tractarians, “*the tradition of the Church Catholic as the legitimate Interpreter of Scripture, or of the Apostles’ Creed.*”^{*} But how does the 8th Article state this point? “The three Creeds—ought thoroughly to be received and believed.” Why? Because we received them by Tradition? No; but because “they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.” And here, let the essential difference be marked, between making a wise and judicious use of what is really valuable, *as tested by Scripture*, in the remains of antiquity, and claiming unqualified submission to their authority as Interpreters of God’s Word. Nor let it be forgotten, in any discussion on this subject, that this *consent of antiquity*, so much talked of, and so ostentatiously paraded, as that to which we are now required to yield subjection, is itself a mere fable; a thing which exists on a few points only, and those not the points of the present controversy. We, “Ultra-Protestants,” as their opponents are contemptuously styled by the Tractarians, also delight in antiquity, and desire to assimilate with *primitive Christianity*, only we would contend for a real, and not a nominal and assumed, antiquity. Let us go back to the first century, to the first portion of that century—to really *apostolic* doctrine and practice, as developed in the New Testament. Here we have *primitive Christianity*. Here, and here only, we have infallibility; and to this standard, to this alone, we claim, and are authorized to claim, implicit obedience.

The first Homily exhorts us to “search for the well of life in the books of the New and Old Testament, and not to run to the puddles of men’s Traditions.” It declares, that “there is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our

^{*} Tract 80, p. 15.

justification and everlasting salvation, but that may be drawn out of that fountain and well of truth." And a judgment is added, to which, on their own principles, our antagonists ought to bow. "*Chrysostom* saith, that man's human and worldly wisdom or science is not needful to the understanding of Scripture, but the revelation of the Holy Ghost who inspireth the true meaning of them, that with humility and diligence do search therefore."

"Where shall we find Him, who is Truth itself, more assuredly than in *the Catholic consent of his Church?*"*

This is the Puseyite argument. But we shall much more assuredly find Him, through the promised guidance of his Spirit, in those Scriptures which we are commanded to "search" for this very purpose, and which we are told are "able to make us wise unto salvation." Let these *antique Churchmen* be reminded of the judgment of their Church in this matter. "We see what vanity the old school doctrine is mixed with, *for that* in this word they sought not the will of God, but rather the will of reason, *the trade of custom, THE PATH OF THE FATHERS, the PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH.*"† And again, "Our Saviour Christ taketh not, and needeth not, any testimony of men, and that which is once confirmed by the certainty of his eternal truth, hath no more need of the confirmation of *man's doctrine and writings, than the bright sun at noontide hath need of the light of a little candle, to put away darkness and to increase his light.*"‡ Shall we trust to Scripture—"the bright sun at noontide," or to Tradition, at best the "*little candle*" of "*man's doctrine and writings?*"

Once more, *the authorized Canons of 1603*, do not countenance any appeal to the Fathers, or Tradition, or the ancient Bishops, as authoritative expounders of Holy Writ. And this observation is more particularly requisite, because an *unauthorized Canon* has been con-

* Tract 80, p. 62.

† Homily for Rogation Week.

‡ Homily against Peril of Idolatry.

sidered so important to the cause, that it has latterly been triumphantly cited in several publications as favouring the appeal to Tradition, and commanding preachers to “take heed that they teach nothing which they would have the people religiously to observe and believe, but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old Testament and the New, and that which *the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have gathered out of that very doctrine.*” Now this very questionable Canon is not found in those at present authorized, and its history ought to be kept in mind. Strype says, the book of Canons of the Convocation of 1571, in which the above is found, was signed by the Bishops and Upper House, but not by the Lower; that the Queen declined giving it a formal assent, which Archbishop Parker was not able to procure, nor was it confirmed by Act of Parliament; and Parker put it forth ‘only for further instruction, and if it pleaseth not, let God do what is good in his eyes.’

Now in opposition to these testimonies, how do the Tractarians, as *professing Churchmen*, speak of Tradition?

“*Scripture and Tradition taken together are the joint rule of faith!*”* Again, “The argument of Ultra-protestantism may be taken, and we may say, ‘The Bible and nothing but the Bible,’ *but this is an unthankful rejection of another great gift EQUALLY from God*, such as no true Anglican can tolerate!”† In the next sentence, it is called “*the sounder view*, that the Bible is ‘the record of necessary truth, or of matters of faith, and the Church Catholic’s tradition is *the interpreter* of it.”

What treachery to the authority and sufficiency of Scripture, and to the Author of Scripture is this, under the mask of humility and deference to *the Church!* Not content with taking the aid of historical testimony, in the legitimate mode, for proving *the Canon* of Scripture, the authority of antiquity is assumed and superadded, for the *interpretation of the Inspired Canon*, and even so

* Tract 78.

† Tract 71, p. 8.

do the Papists in like manner, “making the Word of God of none effect through their traditions.” The following is given as to the right mode of ascertaining divine truth.

“Should it however be asked, *whence* our knowledge of the truth should be derived . . . *it may be replied*, first, *that the writings of the Fathers* contain abundant directions how to ascertain it.”*

Surely the reply ought to be, “*Search the Scriptures*,” and the Church of England does take the Bible as her *rule of faith*, declaring its *sufficiency* to teach all saving truth. But the Puseyites, in common with the Romanists, assert that the Inspired Word of God is *insufficient*, inasmuch as to ascertain truth, it needs to be *interpreted* by Tradition—*needs addition by man* to make it comprehensible, thus daringly impugning the wisdom and goodness of God, as if He had left his Revelation for man’s salvation, deficient in that which concerns his eternal safety! Our Reformers thought differently. “Shall we Christian men think to learn the knowledge of God and of ourselves, *in any earthly man’s book or writing, sooner or better than in the Holy Scriptures*, written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost?”†

Speaking of the doctrine of *Purgatory*, it is said, “If Scripture, *as interpreted by Tradition*, taught it, *we should be bound to receive it*.”‡ How dangerously subversive of the paramount authority of Scripture, is this monstrous position of implicit obedience to the teaching of man!

To trace a little further THE RESULTS of *this system of reference to Antiquity, and the writings of the Fathers*, as necessary for a right acquaintance with saving truth. After a show of learning employed to perplex plain questions, the insinuation naturally follows, how useful must be a knowledge of antiquity to clear up these

* Tract 71, p. 34.

† Tenth Homily of the 2d Book.

‡ Tract 71, p. 12.

doubts, which however owe their existence to similar subtleties. From the *utility* to the *importance* of this knowledge of antiquity, the inference is easy. Next comes its *assumed authority*, and then, it is of course pronounced *indispensable*. Having advanced so far, too much learning is required to ascertain the way of salvation, except through the medium of the expounders of 'the Fathers'—the students of antiquity, so that the more part must needs resort to *the judgment of the Church*. Hence the undue augmentation of the authority and power of the priests. Hence, be it observed, the assumption of spiritual despotism, on the part of the Romish hierarchy, and hence the slavish and superstitious subjection of the people to their rule. Is not the course adopted by the Tractarian School, of the very essence of Popery, and well calculated to throw the Bible into the back-ground, as inadequate for the purpose for which it was given, without the aid of human additions?

The line of argument pursued in the 85th "Tract for the Times," on the subject of Tradition, is too flagrantly mischievous to pass unnoticed. On the subject of succession, &c. it has been already quoted. The writer pursues the same reckless course throughout, and from the infidel tendency of the reasoning, much of it is unfit for quotation. The argument of its 5th Lecture stands thus. Accounts of the same things are related in Scripture with variations or additions. We do not on this ground reject these differing accounts,—*therefore*, we ought not to reject *the additions to Scripture* derived from *Tradition*. A very sound conclusion truly. The author would do well to add a little *reverence for Scripture* to reverence for *Antiquity*.

He further asks,

"Why, when St. John says, 'If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness,' *nothing is said concerning Absolution*, or the Lord's Supper, as *the means of forgiveness*."

Because we are referred just previously to “the blood of Jesus Christ” directly, as *the means of forgiveness*.* But this does not satisfy our author. *Church doctrine*, as it is called, must be supported, and therefore, assuming that if ancient it must be right, it is to be taught and believed. If not developed in Scripture, then *tradition develops it* as an *addition* to Scripture—as *interpreting it*, so that in any case “Church doctrine” *must be maintained*, though the author’s own conclusion is,

“Certainly the tone of the New Testament is unsacramental, and the impression it leaves on the mind is not that of a Priesthood and its attendant system.”†

We have seen something, and shall see more, of the unscriptural system, sought to be upheld under this specious title of *Church doctrine*, and our author’s conclusion is undoubtedly a just one, that recourse must be had in its behalf, to other sources than Scripture. We do not read there of *Absolution* as *the means of forgiveness*, or that forgiveness is dependent on *the will of man*, and therefore neither *dependent* on any priestly power of Absolution, nor yet on the administration or the refusal of the Sacraments. For otherwise, the Priest, and not Christ, would be the Giver of Salvation, and the withholder also, according to his will. And it needs no proof how awfully similar doctrine, has practically prevailed in the Romish Communion, nor how surely, early and gradual corruptions of the nature alluded to above, prepared the way for the Papacy. We willingly admit with the Author therefore, that the tone of the New Testament *is unsacramental* in any such sense, and that it is ‘not that of a Priesthood’ *with any such ‘attendant system.’* Something very different from this, is that affectionate reverence in regard to the sacred office of the Ministers of the Gospel, instilled in the New Testament. “To esteem them very highly in love for their

* “Faith doth directly send us to Christ for remission of our sins.” Homily on Salvation.

† Tract 85, p. 58.

work's sake," who 'have spoken unto us the word of God—to obey them that have the rule over us,' and to follow their faith—such as these constitute the instructions given in Scripture, respecting this important part of christian feeling and conduct, and in which our spiritual welfare is so nearly concerned, regarding the benefits to be derived from the divinely-appointed ordinance of the Christian Ministry.

We must again return to the Tract which has called forth these remarks, and for the purpose of exhibiting in the strongest light, the evil tendency of the determination to exalt Tradition, and how fraught with danger is the result. *Church doctrine*, as it is so falsely called, and *Scripture*, are throughout identified in this production, as *alleged* to rest on equal authority, so that *consistently* to reject one, is to reject both. And to gain admission for this groundless assumption, that the traditions of antiquity, and the truth of Scripture, stand on the same evidence, the wicked attempt is made to shake the testimony for the Canon of Scripture. A writer capable of constructing so plausible and ingenious a specimen of sophistry can scarcely be ignorant enough to be unconscious *that it is mere sophistry*; but if his readers will not adopt his theory and allow the equal authority of tradition, he is regardless of the mischief of unsettling their minds, as to the evidences for the present Canon of Scripture. The whole argument rests on the fallacy that we are bound to receive the opinions of the Fathers, and their interpretations of Scripture, *because* we admit their testimony to the historical *fact*, that such and such books of Scripture were accounted canonical, and formed the received Word of God. We would only ask, do we at the present day *receive all the opinions* of persons, *because* we admit them to be *credible witnesses of certain facts*?

Upon the ground of the consent of antiquity, the 71st Tract reposes,

As to "the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation." "We have the certainty of possessing the entire truth as regards the

high theological doctrines, by an argument *which supersedes the necessity of arguing from Scripture against those who oppose them.*"*

Now, however valuable corroborative historical testimony may be as to *facts*, Articles of *Faith* must be shown to be according to Scripture, and no 'consent of antiquity,' therefore, can '*supersede the necessity*' of so proving them. The exhortation to the Thessalonians,† "Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle," is cited,‡ as requiring "*adherence to the Catholic truth, written and unwritten!*" The writer would have his readers forget, in appreciating this wretched sophistry, that it was the "traditions"—the things delivered, *by inspired Apostles*, the Canon of Scripture not being then complete, which the Thessalonians were commanded to "hold fast." The same argument is used also in the 85th Tract,§ with reference to this and other passages,|| with this addition, that

"*St. Paul himself tells us in Scripture, that there are truths not in Scripture*"—that "the circumstance that it is *extra-scriptural* is no proof that it is *unscriptural*."

Certainly not; it *may be in accordance* with Scripture, but also it may happen that it is not so, and, as mere tradition, can have no independent *authority in matters of faith*. With regard to "St. Paul telling us that there are truths not in Scripture," the absurdity is too manifest almost to require notice, of styling that "Tradition," in the sense here intended, which he received by inspiration from God. "'I delivered unto you' (gave by tradition) 'first of all that which I also received' *by tradition*," is the sagacious comment here given, as suiting the author's argument in behalf of the authority of Tradition. The Tractarians make much of these passages, however, as supporting their cause, for in another place we find again,

* Tract 71, p. 28.

† 2 Thess. ii. 15.

‡ Tract 80, p. 64.

§ P. 43.

|| 1 Cor. xi. 2, 16, 23; xv. 1—3.

“ The voice of God, *whether oral or written*, ‘ the traditions which we have been taught, whether by word or epistle,’ St. Paul has pointed out as the anchor we are to hold by.”*

It is indeed a sinking cause which needs to be thus sustained by misrepresentation of the most obvious meaning of Scripture.

A parallel is attempted to be drawn, in order to support the authority of the Fathers, between the contradictions in their writings, and the apparent difficulties and differences in Scripture narratives of the same transaction.

“ If the Fathers contradict each other in words, *so do passages of Scripture contradict each other.*”†

As further specimens of the mode in which their authority is upheld, the following may suffice :—

“ To say that the ancient Fathers were holy, self-denying, and devout, but at the same time were weak, injudicious, and fanciful, is to transgress the first principle in christian morals, which is, that he ‘ who doeth the will shall know of the doctrine.’”‡

Not a very fair deduction this. It is one of those false conclusions, drawn from insufficient premises, so frequent with these writers. *So far* as they do the will, they will know of the doctrine. But not being infallible, and exempted from falling into error and sin, the Fathers assuredly *may* be weak, injudicious, and fanciful, like other men, nor does it unhappily require an extensive acquaintance with their writings to prove them such in very many instances. We have again the rash assertion, that “ we cannot allow ourselves to think slightly of apostolical Fathers, without thinking so in some degree of Apostles,” &c.§ It is almost needless to observe that this is a fallacy of the same kind, by which to exalt unduly the authority of the Fathers *in matters of faith*, and to place their opinions on ground similar to that of inspired Apostles in the New Testament. The perpetual citation

* Tract 86, p. 40.

† Tract 80, p. 46.

‡ Tract 85, p. 80.

§ P. 67.

of the Fathers for this purpose, in a mode implying that their decisions are imperative, is a lamentable proof of the desire to exalt Tradition. It is also very observable, how indiscriminately the name of any Father is used as authority, to whatever century he may belong, or however he may have been convicted of heresy, fanciful interpretations of Scripture, or superstitious observances and predilections. Yet there is scarcely an error, heresy, or absurdity, which may not be advocated as an opinion of one or other among these ancient doctors. When such a course is resorted to, and enforced as needful for teaching the sense of Scripture, is not the inference a just one, “Lo! they have forsaken *the word of the Lord*, and *what wisdom is in them?*”

PASSAGES ON ROMANISM.

After the preceding specimens of semi-papal teaching on the subject of Tradition, *it will further illustrate the popish tendency of the doctrine advanced by the authors of the “Tracts for the Times,” to quote a few passages, showing THEIR MODE OF DEALING WITH ROMANISTS, and the views presented of PURGATORY, PRAYER FOR THE DEAD, INVOCATION OF SAINTS, &c.*

The 71st Tract, ‘*On the Controversy with the Romanists,*’ might seem almost designed to state the argument speciously for Popery, and feebly for Protestantism. It is really grievous to see the imposing and perplexing statements throughout, on the side of Romanism, and on doctrines having this tendency, with much parade of learning, and a show of apparent reverence and humility, when the object appears to be to keep back truth, and apologize for error in a garb of charity; and also to entangle and entrap the unwary, by a display of mysticism, difficulty, and incomprehensibility. Transubstantiation, for instance, that tremendous source of evil in the Romish Communion, and of tyranny in her priesthood, (declared

in our 28th Article to be repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and to overthrow the nature of a Sacrament,) is dealt with on this principle of mystery, and affectation of superior reverence for the Lord's Supper. It is accordingly advised, that

“The Controversy about the Holy Eucharist *be put into the back-ground*, as almost certain to lead to profane thoughts in the minds of the many,”—and as that which “*cannot well be discussed in words at all, without the sacrifice of godly fear*, while it is well nigh anticipated by the ancient statements, and the determinations of the Church.”

[Evidently to avoid the conclusion that we know from the New Testament, the simple and sufficient truth respecting this sacred ordinance.*]

*†It is not designed to lengthen these Sketches of Puseyism, by any extended comments upon the doctrine advanced on the Sacraments, but a few quotations may show the fearfully delusive importance attached to *a participation in the outward rite*. “The denial of the cup to the Laity. —Considering the great importance of the holy Eucharist to our salvation, this seems a very serious consideration for those who seek to be saved.”† Again, “*The necessity of the Lord's Supper to salvation.*”‡ [As generally necessary to salvation, says the Church Catechism.] And again, as *applied entirely to this Sacrament*, “Our Lord says, ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.’”§ But the Lord's Supper not being then instituted, the whole passage in John vi. (which in the 73d Tract is called the first announcement of the doctrine of the holy Communion,) must be considered as primarily referable to the spiritual reception of Christ into the heart, ‘feeding on him in our hearts by faith;’ and thus most of the *older Fathers* understand it, and witness, says Bishop Jewell, “that Christ speaketh not of the Sacrament, but of the spiritual eating with our faith.” *Augustine* says, ‘Believe and thou hast eaten. Believe in Christ—this is to eat the living bread.’ These are authorities which our *patristic opponents*, at least, ought to appreciate. Once more, Tract 73, p. 12, “The virtue of the holy Communion; how it conveys to us the body and blood of the Incarnate Son crucified, and how, *by partaking it*, body and soul are made spiritual.” Not a syllable here, or in very numerous passages of the same kind, as to the worthy reception to obtain any spiritual benefit thereby. How does such doctrine differ from the Romish *Opus operatum*?

† Tract 71, p. 10.

‡ Tract 85, p. 65.

§ Tract 71.

As might be expected, the writer shrinks from *doctrine*, on the pretext of reverence for sacred things, and wishes to represent the Controversy as touching chiefly some points of *practice*.

“The arguments to be urged against Romanism ought to be taken from such parts of the controversy, as bear most upon practice, and kept clear of what is more especially sacred and painful to dispute about.”

That is to say, keep clear of the *really* important points. Keep back the Protestant *principle*, on which hinges the whole matter in dispute—namely *Justification by faith*, without the deeds of the law; and then, when there is no root whence it can spring, *talk about practice*, for this will do Popery no harm. Neither, we may add, will it hurt Puseyism, for here too it joins hands with

The Sacrament of Baptism having been the subject of a separate Tract, it remains only to notice here the Puseyite statements respecting *sin after baptism*. The language used, Tract 80, for example, on “the question of *sins being admitted to pardon and remission after baptism*,” the “*difficulty of obtaining forgiveness*,” &c. can proceed only from those overlooking the scriptural method of forgiveness, “If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins.” And further, such sentiments are either introductory to the dangerous papal doctrine, of the distinction between venial and mortal sin, or they indicate very inadequate ideas of sin—of the daily and hourly sins of the holiest Christians, for, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us,” and “There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good, and sinneth not.” One of these writers* speaks of a state of repentance being “less honourable, perhaps less safe, *than one in which the baptismal robe has not been defiled*,” which is just as much as saying, *that there is in some no sin*,—no soiling of this baptismal robe of fictitious, non-existent innocence! The same author uses words elsewhere† *equivalent to the assertion* that every baptized person *must be saved*, for this would be the legitimate inference from the argument, that *in every instance*, that spiritual life, and principle of holiness, are communicated in the administration of the outward rite, which life, “hid with Christ in God,” we are taught in Scripture *is* SALVATION.†

* Dodsworth.

† “On the Efficacy of Baptism,” page 11.

‡ Col. iii. 3, 4.

Popery, and both have their source and their strength, in the pride and self-righteousness natural to the human heart.

The writer of this 71st Tract, does not consider that the communion of the Church of Rome, need be quitted on account of the doctrine of Purgatory.

He says, “The Creed of Pope Pius—the Romish Creed of communion, *only* says, ‘I firmly hold there is a Purgatory, *and that souls therein detained are aided by the prayers of the faithful,*’ nothing being said of its being a place of punishment. Now supposing we found ourselves in the Romish communion, it would be a great relief that we were not bound to believe more than this vague statement, nor should we, I conceive, on account of the received interpretation about Purgatory superadded to it, be obliged to leave our church.”*

But, in this vague statement, as it is called, is it not plainly *implied*, though cautiously worded, that Purgatory is *a place of punishment*? If not, *why* should souls be said to be detained there at all, or how otherwise should they *need help—the aid of the prayers of the faithful*? The Anglican Church,† states Purgatory to be “repugnant to the word of God,” and is it not virtually setting aside the Atonement of Christ, to substitute for it, an atonement on the part of man for himself? And if souls in Purgatory be “aided by the prayers of the faithful,” then it is *not* the blood of Jesus Christ that cleanseth *from all sin*, and ‘his one oblation of himself once offered,’ was *not* ‘the *full, perfect, and sufficient* sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction,’ which our Church, in accordance with the Bible, teaches that it was. We have still to inculcate human merit; the prayers of the living are necessary for the dead, and hence follows all the priestcraft of Popery, “with its sacrifices of masses, (in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt,) and every other refuge of lies, with which it beguiles the

* Tract 71, pp. 15, 16.

† 22d Article.

souls of men to their destruction. Yet how leniently do this writer, and others of his class, continually speak of these abominations.* Purgatory has ever been the grand engine of the Papacy, its master-lie, and soul-destroying delusion to persuade men, that when they have passed into eternity, their final doom is yet undecided, and in the power of the priest, or at least within reach of the influence of the purchased masses and prayers of the priest for the repose of the soul. And the all-important doctrine *rejected* by a belief in Purgatory, is the free, full, and finished salvation, wrought out by Jesus Christ our Surety, and offered to all who truly believe in Him. But on this ground our author is silent, and considers that the corrupt Church of Rome *need not be quitted* on account of this monstrous doctrine of Purgatory! In the third part of the Homily on Prayer, we find this scriptural summing up of the subject, after the reasons for not praying for the dead. “Neither let us dream any more, that the souls of the dead are any thing at all holpen by our prayers; but as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man—goeth straightways either to heaven or else to hell, *whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption.* The only Purgatory wherein we must trust to be saved, is the death and blood of Christ, which if we apprehend with a true and stedfast faith, it purgeth and cleanseth us from all our sins—‘with the one oblation of his blessed body and precious blood, he hath made perfect for ever and ever, all them that are sanctified.’”

In regard to the INVOCATION OF SAINTS and PRAYER FOR THE DEAD, the 75th Tract for the Times, (consisting of selected portions of the Breviary for devotional use,)

* “*Speak gently of our Sister's fall,*” is the language of another,† as regards Rome. Speak, let us rather say, as our wiser Reformers did, of her “blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits,”‡ and we shall speak more like those who feel the worth of immortal souls, and dare not trifle with their everlasting welfare.

† Keble's Christian Year.

‡ 31st Article.

includes so many objectionable passages of the above kind, and so many specimens of specious and subtle reasoning in favour of some of them, that it is altogether beyond the limit of these brief Sketches to discuss or quote them. But may it not be fairly asked, *why publish at all for Protestant use such passages?** Why but to bring them forward in a plausible and misleading form, mixed up with truth, and wearing the deceptive aspect of devotion. For the disciples of this new Oxonian school of opposition to the doctrines of the Church of England, speak elsewhere of prayer for the dead, not as a *corruption*, but as a practice, of ancient date, consolatory to the feelings of mourners, &c. In the “Plain Sermons, by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times,” to which further reference will be made, it is said—

“*Whether we can do them (the dead) good or no, we perhaps know not.*”† The 85th Tract goes further, stating it as “the church’s *doctrine* [Tradition] that there is an intermediate state, that in it the souls of the faithful are purified and grow in grace, that they pray for us, *and that our prayers benefit them.*”‡

“Appended to this selection from the Breviary, are services in commemoration of Bishop Ken! and for the

* Why give for example such as the following, and without animadversion or observation? “Blessed Laurence, Martyr of Christ, *intercede for us.*”* “Grant that *by the deserts* of (Peter and Paul) *we may obtain everlasting glory.*”† “And meekly implore, *Our pardon may wait, On his triumph in heaven.*”‡ We are informed, p. 119, that “only one hymn here translated savours of Romanism,” and that just cited is not the hymn pointed out, so that the writer does not think it Popery! In furnishing portions of the Breviary as models of devotion, ought these and similar things to have been included? Was it needful, or would it have been done but to serve a purpose—to show that Prayer for the Dead, Invocation, in one form or other, of saints, &c. were practices of considerable antiquity, and with these men, this is tantamount to the defensibleness, though more is constantly insinuated, than openly and candidly stated; often rather implied, than directly asserted.

† Page 104.

‡ P. 48.

anniversaries of the death of friends, and here we have *as prayer*, for in this connexion it is nothing less, “ May their souls rest in peace,”* and again, “ Into thy hands we commend their spirit.”† What need on any other supposition than that of praying for the dead, of *commending the spirits* of those already departed? In the previous sentence we have, “ *In the valley of the shadow of death, They shall fear no evil.*” The twenty-third Psalm is indeed strangely applied, to such a purpose as that of intimating, that those *blessed dead which die in the Lord*, are still *in that valley of the shadow of death*, through which they have safely passed, made “ more than conquerors through him that loved them.”‡

It is true that some of the addresses to the virgin &c. included in the portions of the Breviary, given in this 75th Tract, are animadverted upon, but other things of the same kind are palliated and excused. Brevity admits only a single example. §

“ As to the confession in which is introduced, the name of the blessed Virgin and other saints, this practice stands on a different ground. It is not a simple gratuitous invocation made to them, but it is an address to Almighty God in his heavenly court, as surrounded by his saints and angels, answering to St. Paul’s charge to Timothy, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the elect angels, and to Daniel and St. John’s address to the angels who were sent to them. The same may even be said of

* The *Vesper Service* contains that which may serve as an exposition of the meaning of the above, “ May the souls of the faithful through God’s mercy, rest in peace.” p. 81.

† Page 147.

‡ It is unnecessary to advert here to the painful and cheerless representations of the separate state, made by some of these writers, and by a few others, further than to observe, that they owe their origin, not to Scripture, but to the opinions of some of the Fathers—among them one so early as Tertullian. As a reputed *Montanist*, we may well suspect the soundness of his judgment on other points, and allow it also to serve as a warning, against admitting merely human opinion as authority in matters of faith.

§ From page 10.

the invocation, ‘Holy Mary and all Saints,’ &c. in the Prime Service, which Gavanti describes as being of very great antiquity.”

Now first we may observe that this address cannot *answer* to St. Paul’s charge to Timothy, or derive any support from it, unless we are at liberty to read, *the Virgin, the Baptist, Peter, Paul, and all Saints*, for ‘God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels,’ in whose presence St. Paul supposes himself as giving the charge. Neither can it *answer to Daniel and St. John’s* address to the angels sent to them, for Daniel was requesting information, not praying to the angel, and St. John was twice rebuked, and not encouraged by the angel to worship him. ‘*See thou do it not.*’ But further, this is *not* ‘an address to Almighty God, as *surrounded*’ merely by his saints and angels. With the sophistry and misrepresentation so usual with these writers, it will be found that *instead of being as above stated*, it is actually *confessing* to the Virgin and the Saints, equally with God, *and their prayers are requested*—in plain English, without the help of a jesuitical comment, *it is praying to the Virgin, to these Apostles, to the Saints, and—to God.* The following are the addresses in question.*

“Prime Service. People. *I confess* before God Almighty, *before the Blessed Mary, Ever Virgin, the blessed Michael Archangel, the blessed John Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, before all Saints*, and thee my Father, that I have sinned too much in thought, word, and deed. It is my fault, my fault, my grievous fault. Therefore, *I beseech thee, blessed Mary, Ever Virgin, the blessed Michael Archangel, the blessed John Baptist, the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, all saints*, and thee my Father, TO PRAY THE LORD OUR GOD FOR ME.”
 “*Holy Mary and all the Saints*, INTERCEDE FOR US TO THE LORD, that we may be worthy of his help and salvation, who liveth and reigneth world without end.”

* Pp. 61, 62.

The Author adds,

“These usages certainly *now*” [if *now*—then always] “do but sanction the direct worship of the blessed Virgin and the Saints, but *it is worth pointing out*, that as on the one hand *they have more claim to be considered an integral part* of the service, so on the other, *more can be said towards their justification* than for those addresses especially under our consideration.”

Nothing more can, or ought to be, said about them, than that they were *earlier* corruptions, but *still corruptions*, of primitive Christianity, but it is ever a grand object with the “Tractarians,” to make us forget that a practice of antiquity, *so called*, might be a *corruption*. This is a fair specimen of the subtle, apologetic strain, of extenuating and explaining away error, of which complaint has been made. Let the reader decide whether justly or otherwise.

PART II.

PUSEYITE PRINCIPLE OF RESERVE IN COMMUNICATING RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.—THE PRACTICAL EFFECT OF THIS PRINCIPLE TO VEIL THE TRUTH IN MYSTERY.—FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRINCIPLE OF RESERVE AS REGARDS THE PREACHING OF THE ATONEMENT.—JUSTIFICATION, AS EXPLAINED BY SCRIPTURE AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND OPPOSED TO PUSEYISM.—THE CONNECTION OF VARIOUS OPPOSING SECTS AND HERESIES.

It remains to consider THE PUSEYITE PRINCIPLE OF RESERVE *in communicating religious knowledge*, and to trace this fruitful source of error in its practical working and effects, *as actuating the obscuration of truth* IN MYSTERY; developing itself further *as regards the character of preaching, in the concealment on system* OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT; substituting in place of this teaching, *the cultivation of* NATURAL PIETY, to which as in fact, ‘*making men meet to receive grace*’—the understanding of divine things will be communicated; thus virtually *overthrowing the doctrine of Scripture and the Church of England, on the subject of* JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH, and resting that justification, in part at least, on the worthiness and merit of man, *as the result of obedience on his part*, instead of teaching that obedience as *the fruit and consequence of justification—the good fruit from the good tree*. And lastly, THE CONNECTION *of various sects and heresies will be noticed*.

Let us first examine THE PRINCIPLE OF RESERVE, and

notice also its necessary result of obscuring the truth IN MYSTERY.

The 80th Tract for the Times, is that developing in detail the doctrine of Reserve, but the 87th has since been added on the same subject, apparently in consequence of the censure which the first had so justly encountered. To examine and refute every objectionable position advanced in these Tracts, or in other publications noticed in these brief Sketches, would of course be impracticable, but it is only necessary to show the pervading character of the doctrine contained in them, and this is the more requisite with regard to the 87th Tract, because it has been lately stated by Dr. Pusey,* to have superseded the

* In his late Preface to his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford. In consequence of the view given subsequently in these pages, it may be well to explain, that this Preface, (containing Dr. Pusey's elaborate defence of the doctrine of his party *on Justification*, illustrated by numerous passages from the Sermons of Mr. Newman,) comprises substantially the sentiments of the "Plain Sermons, by contributors to the Tracts for the Times," so frequently quoted in the following pages. In a word, we are *justified at baptism*, therefore *no subsequent conversion is needed*, but—our continuance in a justified state depends upon ourselves—upon our own works, and will do so to the end. St. Paul says, "*being justified by faith*" (not by baptism, for we were incapable of faith if baptized as infants) "*we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,*" and then, *having "received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him, rooted and built up in him."* This is not the place to controvert the glosses too often, as the writer is well aware, put upon these and similar texts. It is only now designed to mark out *the two kinds* of Justification. That of the Tractarian school, is of the law, do this and live, not that of the Gospel, believe and live—believe and be holy, because of the implanted love of holiness. The Tractarian scheme, is working *for* life; not *from* life, which principle of life, being also one of love, effectually worketh to holiness in them that believe. The Tractarian doctrine then, is not that of a free, a complete, or a present, justification, like that of which we read in Scripture—like that for which our great Reformers, and noble army of Martyrs contended, and from which Dr. Pusey and his companions *now* formally acknowledge their dissent. Great names, as respects learning, have been adduced on their side as on the other, but learning is not necessarily truth, erudition may be in error; talent and ingenuity form no security for a right apprehension of spiritual things. And it is

necessity of any further explanation of the misapprehensions connected with the 80th Tract, and as removing the grounds of objection by that explanation and further development. Now it may surprise the Reader to be informed, that not only is there no retractation of the objectionable statements of the 80th Tract, but that these are repeated and enforced. The *style* is more cautious and more subtle, and care is taken to introduce a certain amount of truth, which is then explained away and nullified by subsequent contradictions. The writer also courageously *assumes* throughout, (though sensibly enough not undertaking the hopeless task of *proving*,) that Scripture is on his side. There is a good deal besides of gratuitous misrepresentation, of the doctrine commonly understood under the term Evangelical, and even if this be admitted to arise from ignorance of the principles of his opponents, they ought at least to have been more accurately ascertained previously to controverting them. For the rest, there is much trouble taken as usual, to make ‘the worse appear the better reason.’ It deserves observation also, that many of the passages cited as proofs of reserve from the Fathers, will not bear the peculiar meaning forced upon them, but merely signify, not a designed concealment of truth, but that spiritual things could be spiritually apprehended, only by the *spiritually-minded*.

The following extracts will sufficiently prove the identity of the sentiments, with those of the 80th Tract, to be presently considered. Other specimens from the 87th, will be given in connection with the subjects to which they refer.

As before, the opinion is strongly condemned,

“That it is necessary to bring forward prominently and explicitly on all occasions *the doctrine of the Atonement*.” “It

well known, how soon the purity and simplicity of the Reformation standard of doctrine, on justification by faith, became corrupted, and how extensive was that lamentable defection which took place.

is a plan thoroughly unscriptural, un-catholic; we will at once allow that this maxim of Reserve is directly opposed to it." Again, "The teaching of the Church, which keeps the doctrine of the Atonement *in the reserve of Scripture!*" "To suppose that a doctrine so mysterious as the Atonement, *is to be held out to the impenitent sinner*, to be embraced in some manner to move the affections." "A principle quite opposed to these modern opinions, which speak of the *display* of God's mercy in the Atonement." "There is no scriptural sanction for the necessity of our always thrusting forward the doctrine of the Atonement without reserve."*

Having seen in the above extracts, something of the fearful character of the statements made on this subject, the agreement of the principles of the two Treatises will be seen, by the subsequent references to the 80th Tract, which will be principally taken as the groundwork of the following remarks, the doctrine of Reserve being there professedly unfolded. Its writer's object, in so urgently pressing the occasionally reserved tone of instruction adopted by our Lord, as that to be exclusively imitated, is easily seen. But the more limited information on some points, desirable at the outset, and before the work of Redemption was accomplished, was assuredly not that considered desirable or sufficient afterwards, or the remainder of the New Testament would not have been added. Though the author may be unmindful of the source, it is Socinianism thinly disguised, thus to endeavour to oppose one part of the Bible to another, the teaching of Jesus to that of his Apostles inspired by his Spirit. It is *virtually* rejecting the further revelation, vouchsafed after the completion of the work of salvation, thus to make the necessarily more obscure and parabolic style of the Gospels, the exclusive pattern of teaching, after type and shadow were superseded by the Great Antitype, and the way 'into the Holiest' made manifest by his blood. Yet it is on a

* Tract 87, pp. 47, 48, 61, 65, 68, 69.

fallacy of this kind, that a very considerable part of the argument of the Tract in question is constructed.

One strong hold of the author, is that *the principle of Reserve*, was shewn in the dealings of God with the heathen world, in keeping back the knowledge of Revelation, and again in the case of the Jewish nation, not having the full light of Gospel truth under the Mosaic dispensation. But who does not see that *the real question at issue* is not why it pleased God thus to act, but whether *we* are to presume to throw a veil over what is now revealed?

It is asserted,

That “*Our Lord never said that he was the Christ,*”*—that “*It was the Divinity of our Lord which could not be disclosed without so much danger.*”†

This point is much dwelt upon, *to prove the danger now* of an unreserved declaration of *the Divinity and Atonement of Christ*. It is surely simply necessary to contradict such unwarranted statements. The discourses in St. John’s Gospel, for instance, have only to be consulted, to show that our Lord, most explicitly, repeatedly, and publicly declared his Divinity. HE, therefore, saw none of this danger arising from the declaration, and that the Jews understood his claim, is evident, from their accusation of blasphemy *for making himself God*.‡ The parable of the new wine received into old bottles, is said

“*To indicate the exceeding danger of the Gospel being received into the unregenerate heart of the old man.*”§

It need only be observed, in reply, that this *exceeding danger* would be the salvation of the receiver. In accordance, however, with this *Tractarian view of danger*, we have further a representation of “*the dangerous consequences,*” of “*the knowledge of divine truth being*

* Tract 80, p. 67.

† Tract 80, p. 15.

‡ John x. 33.

§ Tract 80, p. 25.

*forced upon men of corrupt lives, and put forward without this sacred reserve.”** It may be left to the author to inform us, how *the corrupt lives* are to be amended, *without acquaintance with divine truth*, and how it can be received, if not known.

Again, the author considers, as confirming the above opinions,

“The many passages in the Epistles, in which the Apostle speaks of his *care, not to impart divine knowledge to those who are not worthy to receive it.*”†

There are not many of these passages, but in none of them does the Apostle speak of the knowledge of salvation through Christ, which he preached to all, without exception. It may also be asked, *to whom* would this knowledge have been imparted, if only to those who were *worthy to receive it*? Surely to none of our fallen race. The next sentence of this strange argument states, That “*A full and adequate reason for this withdrawing and withholding of divine truth*, might be shown in passages which speak of the great danger of a revelation of God to man, as a savour of death, as well as a savour unto life.”

The reply to this most groundless assertion is, that this is never given as *a reason* at all, *for withholding the truth*, but only named as the awful consequence of a wilful rejection of an offered salvation.‡ We learn from the Epistles, and from the Acts of the Apostles that their teaching consisted in preaching Christ, his all-sufficient Atonement, and remission of sin by his blood, through faith, itself the gift of God. This was the doctrine, having for its glorious results, ‘obedience to the faith,’ ‘gladness, singleness of heart,’ the devotedness of love, and all ‘the fruits of the Spirit.’ But in opposition to this, we are told *by the Tractarian preachers*, of the

“Holy reserve God expects men to practise, in communicating the high mysteries of Christ to the world! . . . not to be

* Tract 80, p. 60. † Tract 80, p. 27. ‡ 2 Cor. ii. 14—16.

made matter of conversation with all sorts of people, pious and thoughtless, self-willed and humble." And it is spoken of as matter of further lamentation, that "*as times are now, one can hardly keep very unworthy persons from knowing the sayings which convey the knowledge of the Trinity, and other great and awful secrets in religion.*" *

It requires little consideration of such sentiments as above quoted, to become aware of *their practical result* TO VEIL THE TRUTH IN MYSTERY. The knowledge of divine truth is represented as dangerous, and therefore not to be indiscriminately communicated. The Bible furnishes no authority for such maxims, and therefore the practice of a so-called antiquity, is resorted to in support of them, and some detached texts of Scripture, plausibly misinterpreted, are brought forward, as we have seen, to give colour to them.

But further, the author of this 80th Tract, in common with the other writers of his party, aims at resolving into incomprehensible mystery, the plainest truths of the Gospel, disuniting them from their practical bearing and influences, and making out a creed for the head, rather than a religion for the heart. This induces the mode of speaking of the doctrines of the Trinity, and the Incarnation for instance, as abstract and theoretical only, simply to be believed as such, overlooking their spiritual application, as "the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," because an apology is desired for keeping back the glorious truths of those stupendous engagements, undertaken by the Trinity in Unity for the salvation of sinners.

Again, by resolving *the Sacraments* into merely incomprehensible mysteries, the Puseyite writers arrive at most unscripturally magnifying *the outward rite*. Mystery is their favourite resort, on every occasion, when they design to outstep the warrant of Scripture, and would introduce subservience to human tradition,

* "Plain Sermons." XXIX. p. 269.

and the corruptions of former ages. To cite the various passages of this description, would be to quote a large part of these compositions. The principle pervades the whole, and is used to defend the most unwarrantable views.*

In connection with this *reserve and mystery*, we have the opinions of the writer of the Tract under consideration, respecting efforts to promote religion. The following may show the line of argument pursued, but the limits assigned to these Sketches, preclude a full development of the subject as thus singularly stated.†

“ If the erection of churches, which from easiness of access, are to invite . . . is to do the work of religion, then it is more easy to win souls than Scripture will warrant us in supposing. On the contrary, if the maxim be true, that men venerate that which resisteth them, and that which courteth their favour they despise,”‡ [a sufficiently heathenish application, be it observed, of a heathen sentiment,] “ then have we to fear, lest, rather than doing good, we be breaking that holy law, that we give not that which is holy to the dogs . . . For if churches are to be brought home to all, then are all persons to be brought into churches, and this by human means.” “ Sacred things brought out of their chaste *reserve*, and put forth to attract.”

Can such sentiments require refutation with those who believe, on the authority of the Bible, that it is their bounden duty to use all legitimate means, for bringing their fellow sinners, acquainted with the truth as it is in

* It is not intended to deny, in the above observations, in any justifiable sense, that there is much of mystery, that is, much that we are incapable of fully comprehending, in the doctrines of Scripture, for how can our *finite* understandings reach the acts, and the attributes, of an *Infinite God*? That which is here condemned is, *that man should mystify what God has revealed*; and that a mysterious power of conveying salvation, should be given to Sacraments, of which Scripture knows nothing, which robs Christ of his honour, and deludes the victims of such doctrine to their eternal ruin, *while trusting to “ the form, and denying the power of godliness.”*

† Tract 80, p. 69.

‡ Thucydides, as cited in the Tract.

Jesus, and that they are thus obeying the command of God, “Who will have all men to be saved, *and to come unto the knowledge of the truth?*” If the author be right, then we are *not* to be ‘workers together’ with God, in proclaiming that “life and immortality brought to light by the Gospel,” and “he that winneth souls, is” no longer “wise.”

Again,*

“Much of what is here said may be applied to an indiscriminate distribution of Bibles and religious publications . . . we have rather to look with awe on these new dealings of Providence with mankind. It might be thought . . . that to bring the truth forward before persons unprepared to acknowledge it does not signify. *Such persons cannot receive it*, and therefore the effect is merely nugatory. This does not follow. *That they cannot receive it is the appointment of God, but our attempting to act contrary to his mode of acting may be productive of evil. . . . Are we rightly estimating the consequence of a bare knowledge of the Gospel?*”

In answer to this extraordinary announcement, it must be demanded on what ground *we* are at liberty to presume to decide upon the state of the heart, and who will, and who will not receive the Gospel? What right have we thus to consider others out of the reach of mercy? What was St. Paul’s exhortation? “Preach the word.” —To those *supposed to be prepared to receive it?* No. “Be instant in season, out of season.” Preach the word, plant, water, and trust to God to give the increase. Let us obey God, and leave the result to him, instead of presumptuously flying in the face of his commands, and walking according to the foolish devices of our own imaginations. Our author supports his theory, by the usual resort of reference to *the Fathers* so called. O may we take the warning, and make *the Word of God* the “lamp to our feet, and the light unto our path.”

The numerous passages discouraging active efforts in

* Tract 80, pp. 70, 71.

the cause of God, under a fair-seeming show of humility, and superior sanctity and devotion, would be too extended for citation here. It is a principal, and most mistaken object with the Puseyite writers, to inculcate, as far as possible, the old corruption of a monastic seclusion from the world; forgetting that good men are Agents for God on earth, the Instruments whereby He is pleased to work, and that they must no more shrink from the imperative practical duties thus devolving upon them, than neglect to seek strength for their fulfilment in secret communion with God. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." What a far nobler and more exalted exercise of Christian self-denial, the abundant labours and the active zeal of St. Paul, in his arduous course for the everlasting benefit of his fellow creatures, than the subsequent abandonment of useful exertion and social duty, and the voluntary retirement and will-worship of the sequestered recluse, adopted in an age less pure in doctrine, and therefore mistaken in practice. The evil of such a life is seen, in its failing to manifest *in the world, and yet not of it*, the living influence of Christian faith and love, in a resolute opposition to the spirit and conduct of that world, and with the high and holy determination to bear that decided testimony for God among men, which may subserve their eternal welfare, and will most assuredly bring with it "the reproach of Christ," but which is, notwithstanding, "greater riches than the treasures of Egypt;" and be it remembered, that to take up this cross and follow him, is our Lord's test of true discipleship.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRINCIPLE OF RESERVE, AS REGARDS THE PREACHING OF THE ATONEMENT.

“THE PREACHING OF THE CROSS IS TO THEM THAT PERISH FOOLISHNESS; BUT UNTO US WHICH ARE SAVED IT IS THE POWER OF GOD.” 1 COR. I. 18.

The principle of Reserve, as it regards *the character of Preaching, in the concealment on system of* THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT, comes now under consideration. *The depreciation of the importance of preaching*, is a marked feature of Puseyism, and originates in the imitation of ancient abuses.

Preaching, it is said,

“May be necessary in a weak and languishing state, but it is the characteristic of this system [Evangelical religion, God grant it ever may be such] *as opposed to that of the Church*, and we fear the undue exaltation of an instrument which *Scripture, to say the least, has never much recommended.*”

O the daring misstatements of Scripture, with which the Tracts for the Times unhappily abound! Was the uniform practice of the Apostles and first teachers of Christianity, *that of preaching the Gospel or not?* And where do we find in the New Testament that preaching was “never much recommended?” The Parisian Breviary, among other testimonies, is brought forward with this object of depreciating preaching.

“In its long services for the feast of Dedication . . . there appears no allusion to this end as the object of building Churches, viz. *the converting of persons by preaching.* Whatever objection may be made to this testimony, *it serves at all events to prove what the religion of a former age was.*”*

And of *a dark age* too. But whenever the Church has most flourished, and whenever also the most signal revivals of religion have taken place, from the days of

* Tract 80, p. 69.

the Apostles to the present hour; then has preaching—the unreserved preaching of the Atonement of Christ, and the free and full salvation which is in Him, most abounded. And notwithstanding the opposition or indifference, of nominal or misguided disciples, and the scorn of a world which lieth in wickedness, it still pleases God, by his own appointed Instrument, “by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe.” The preaching of the Atonement, is spoken of by this Puseyite writer, as “*a new principle unknown to former ages.*”^{*} It was however very well known to St. Paul and his coadjutors, when they preached the Sermons in the Acts of the Apostles.

“This principle,” proceeds our Author, “*is that the highest and most sacred of all Christian doctrines, is to be brought before, and pressed home to, all persons indiscriminately, and most especially to those who are leading unchristian lives.*”

And why is this course, so strongly reprobated by the Puseyite school, to be pursued? Surely that, as “faith cometh by hearing,” these persons may hear the Gospel call, “Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,” and because “the Gospel of Christ—is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” The Author adds,

“So far from it being considered necessary to keep persons from Church on account of irreligious lives, it is usually thought that every thing is done if they can be brought to it.”

[Where is the *New Testament example* to be found, of *sinner being excluded from the preaching of the Gospel*? It is only to be met with, as these *Idolaters of a fictitious and spurious Antiquity* well know, among the figments and distortions of a later age.]

Again, “The prevailing notion of bringing forward *the Atonement explicitly and prominently* on all occasions.”

[How otherwise could the Apostolic reply be given to the enquiry, ‘What must I do to be saved?’ Could these semi-popish Tractarians answer, *consistently with their own expressed sentiments*, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved,” and *if not*, are they not condemned out of their own mouths?] But to continue.

“It, (the prevailing notion of bringing forward the Atonement,) is evidently *quite opposed* to what *we consider* the teaching of Scripture! Nor do we find any sanction for it in the Gospels!! If the Epistles of St. Paul *appear* to favour it, it is only at first sight!!!”*

The writer proceeds to *account* for “*the occasions* on which St. Paul brings forward this doctrine,” but he must *account* for its being brought forward *on all occasions*, and that most “*explicitly and prominently*.” The true way of *accounting for it*, however, is that St. Paul believed Christ to be “the power of God and the wisdom of God,” and therefore he says, “we preach Christ crucified.”† He believed that there was “none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved,” and therefore, inspired by the Holy Ghost, he taught continually, that “*By Him* all that believe are justified from all things.”

The Author further argues, that when

“St. Paul speaks of himself as at all times preaching Christ crucified—it will be evident on a little attention that *it is not the Atonement and Divinity of our Lord that he brings forward!* although it is implied in that saying. *It is a very different view, and in fact the opposite to the modern notion, which St. Paul always intends by it.* It is the necessity of our being crucified to the world, it is our humiliation together with Him, mortification of the flesh.”‡

* Tract 80, p. 74.

† 1 Cor. i. 23, 24.

‡ In the “Plain Sermons,” the same assertion occurs. “Jesus Christ crucified, *that is, the taking up our Cross*, and following him practically, in fasting and abstinence, in mortification and self-denial, must be *the foundation on which the faith of high doctrines must be built.*” Sermon

Argument would appear to be out of place, with assertion so directly and palpably in face of the truth. It is as painful as it would be difficult, suitably to characterize such awful perversion of the plain meaning of Scripture. Nor ought it to be forgotten, that it is most essentially Popish, thus to degrade the work of Christ for sinners, into a legal, self-righteous work on our part, as a ground of hope towards God, a means of acquiring *a worthiness*, as is elsewhere said, for the blessings of salvation. It is the idea of human merit, which prompts and pervades such statements, however plausible and specious may seem the grounds on which they are maintained.

The "Tractarians" enter their protest against what they term, "the popular theology of the day," pronouncing it *a striking contrast to what ought to be taught*, because this theology is stated by them to be as follows.

*"That the Atonement is the chief doctrine of the Gospel; that it is chiefly to be regarded, not as a wonder in heaven, and in its relation to the Attributes of God, and the unseen world, but in its experienced effects on our minds, in the change it effects when it is believed."**

It is untrue that the Atonement is not preached by anti-Puseyite and evangelical theologians, *in its relation to the attributes of God*. The defect in this respect will be found on the other side. But further, the grand practical question for each of us, is actually comprehended in

xxix. p. 265. [The reader it is hoped, need scarcely be reminded, how entirely contrary to Scripture is such teaching. We have there *first* the faith, and then, as the necessary result, and unfailing test, its consequences. As expressed in the 5th Homily, "*Where the faith of Christ is not the foundation*, there is no good work, what building soever we make. There is one work, in the which be all good works, that is *faith*, which worketh by charity; if thou have it, thou hast the ground of all good works." And the 4th Homily, "*The true, lively, and Christian faith*, is no dead, or unfruitful thing, but of wonderful operation and strength, *bringing forth all good motions and good works.*"

* Tract 73, p. 13.

the very point calling forth the sneer of our opponents, namely, "*the experienced effects on our minds, the change*" which the true reception of this Gospel doctrine, "*effects where it is believed.*" In relation to man, the Atonement truly is "the chief doctrine of the Gospel," for its reception is life eternal. "*He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life.*" And when this doctrine ceases to be thus regarded, we may write Ichabod on our National Church, for its glory will be departed. But we must first destroy those formularies, which so fully set forth Jesus Christ in all his Offices, as the Almighty and all-sufficient Saviour, and the Holy Trinity, as engaged in that work of inconceivable love and mercy, for us miserable sinners who lay in darkness and the shadow of death, that we might be made the children of God, and exalted to everlasting life.

The writer before quoted undertakes to explain, that "*The cause of the extraordinary prevalence of this modern opinion, of the necessity of preaching the Atonement thus explicitly* seems to be, that the doctrine of the Atonement is *secretly* implied in the whole of Scripture."*

There is indeed an "*extraordinary prevalence of this modern opinion*" in the Services and the Homilies of the Church of England, and certainly no great care taken to keep the Atonement "a secret." And our Church thus closely follows the example of Scripture. The preachers of the Atonement are afterwards actually accused, of developing a disguised shape of Socinianism, and it is singularly added, that "*all corruptions tend to that Apostasy which shall deny the Son.*" The writer thus undesignedly supplies himself and his associates with a most important lesson, for who so effectually "*deny the Son,*" as those who refuse to declare his atonement, as the only foundation of hope for eternity? "*I am the way, the truth, and the life,*" says our blessed Lord himself, as the sum of his own teaching. "He that cometh to me shall

* Tract 80, p. 79.

never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."

In demonstrating the anti-scriptural views entertained by the Puseyite party, it is indispensably requisite, but it is most painful, to bring to light, even in the foregoing very limited form, such sentiments as the preceding. They cannot but grieve and shock the minds of those who are themselves resting, and desiring to lead others to rest, on that peace-speaking Atonement of their Lord, which can alone bring pardon and reconciliation with God. *If there be salvation only in Christ*, and yet his Atonement be the doctrine to be concealed and kept back, *on what ground, so far as the salvation of the hearers be concerned*, can preaching proceed? Jesus is able "*to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him*;" and we have the promise and the oath of God, in order that "we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us."* We can have this "strong consolation," only by knowing and believing that Atonement, which must be the ground of our hope towards God; *and if it be not preached*, how can a minister pretend that he is presenting this only true source of confidence to his people? Again, "the love of Christ," we are told, is the constraining principle,† *and if we know it not*, how can it influence? *Yet so it must be*, on the Puseyite principle of systematic Reserve, and concealment of the Atonement.

To see this more fully, only let us for a moment reflect on the whole tenor of the New Testament. What is the uniform principle laid down, as the producing cause through the influence of the Holy Spirit, of our love to God, resulting in Christian obedience? It is, without exception, that of the love of God *manifested to us in Christ*. "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "*Hereby perceive we the love of God*, because he laid down his

* Heb. vii. 25, with vi. 17, 18.

† 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.

life for us." "We love Him *because He first loved us.*" "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."* And it is on this ground of his love in Jesus Christ, that God is pleased to demand our hearts and our love in return. Can there be a stronger argument, that this love of God in Christ—Redemption through the Atonement of "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," is to be universally, unequivocally, openly, and fully declared to our fellow sinners? It is at least making ourselves wiser than God to presume to teach otherwise. It is opposing the method marked out in his Word, and incurring the tremendous guilt of concealing his plan of salvation from our fellow creatures, in wilful and direct disobedience to his command.

JUSTIFICATION AS EXPLAINED BY SCRIPTURE AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND OPPOSED TO PUSEYISM.

"WE THROUGH THE SPIRIT, WAIT FOR THE HOPE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS BY FAITH."—Gal. v. 5.

"*The sum of all Paul's disputation is this ; that if Justification come of works, then it cometh not of grace ; and if it come of grace, then it cometh not of works.*" 3d Homily.

Refusing, as we have seen, to make the Atonement the subject and foundation of their teaching, the Puseyite party propose to substitute THE CULTIVATION OF NATURAL PIETY, to which, as '*making men meet to receive grace,*' *confering a preparatory worthiness for its reception,* the understanding of divine things will be communicated. It must be afterwards shewn, *how entirely the doctrine of Scripture and the Church of England on the subject of Justification by Faith,* is overthrown by such statements.

* Rom. v. 8. 1 John iii. 16 ; iv. 19. John iii. 16.

A few brief extracts, explaining the Puseyite theology respecting this *natural piety*, are previously necessary.

It is stated to be *the object* of the 80th Tract, to ascertain,

“Whether there is not in God’s dealings with mankind, a very remarkable holding back of sacred and important truths.” [Inferring hence that *we may now conceal* what God has revealed, *because* it was not sooner revealed!] “as if the knowledge of them,” continues our Sophist, “were injurious to persons *unworthy of them*.” [Can the persons *worthy* of God’s favour be found among us ?]

Again,

“*As if it were injurious to us*, unless we were of a certain disposition to receive it.” “*The manifestation of our Lord was seen to imply some very great and peculiar danger, when the heart was not prepared to receive it.*”*

Now besides that this alleged “great and peculiar danger,” is a gratuitous assertion, utterly unsupported by Scripture, it is entirely overlooked in this and similar observations, which are of continual recurrence, that *the preparation of heart* necessary for the right reception of spiritual truth, is of the Lord, and not of man; and though the want of that disposition of mind is truly moral guilt, consequent upon man’s responsibility, yet it is equally true that “*the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God*; for they are foolishness unto him: *neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*” The views of the writers under consideration, upon Baptismal Regeneration, preclude their urging the necessity of this spiritual change of heart at all, and accordingly the solemn declaration of the indispensable necessity of conversion, in our Lord’s discourse to Nicodemus,† is termed “a modern gloss, in which some persons imbued with modern glosses, *will discern but a practical exhortation to conversion, change*

* Tract 80, pp. 3, 60.

† John iii.

of heart, and the like.”* It is needless to enter here upon the mode by which this Tractarian theory is supported, viz. the “glosses” of a spurious antiquity.

Instead of the conversion repudiated as a “modern gloss,” we have the two following requisites for the *right reception of the truth*.

“We should form high conceptions of the divine promises and expressions, as, for instance, ‘This is my body,’ and the second requisite, is such an interest as would open our minds to acquiesce in the proofs of probable evidence. *Both of these would make the reception of the truth to depend upon natural piety.*”† Again, “All divine and saving knowledge is derived by pains on the part of man.”‡

How strongly do the multiplied expressions of this nature, scattered through these writings, imply worthiness and merit in man, an ability and natural power, in our fallen state, to receive heavenly truth without divine assistance; for we exclude the necessity of Divine Influence to change and prepare the heart, if we attribute the reception of gospel truth to “*natural piety*.” Our tenth Article, it will be remembered, refutes this idea of natural piety, and power of self-preparation, for the acceptable service of God. “The condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is such, *that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God.*” But Puseyite doctrine teaches differently.

“That the preparations of the heart which can alone receive the faith—are by other means than this system (preaching the Atonement) we cannot but be assured—it is by insisting first of all if need be *on natural piety*, the necessity of common honesty, *repentance, judgment,*” &c.§

As a contrast, let the Church of England speak her own doctrine. “*They are greatly deceived that preach repentance without Christ*, and teach the simple and

* Tract 73, p. 26.

† Tract 87, p. 37.

‡ Tract 80, p. 66.

§ Tract 87, p. 50.

ignorant that it consisteth only in the works of men—They may indeed speak many things of good works, and of amendment of life and manners, but without Christ they be all vain and unprofitable.” And again, “They that teach repentance without a lively faith in Christ, *do teach none other than Judas’s repentance, as all the schoolmen do.*”* But the Tractarians, directly opposing their Church’s teaching, say,

“We must again repeat the same point. *Good works* must ever *make* a good man.”

They may as well express themselves on the next occasion, in the well-known semi-infidel couplet,

“*For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,
His can’t be wrong whose life is in the right.*”

“To ameliorate the heart and practice is the only way to arrive at the riches hid in Christ.” They further assert that such a system as above expressed in the Homily, is “opposed to Scripture—puts knowledge [faith] first, and obedience afterwards, and says, let this doctrine be received, and good works will necessarily follow.”†

And what does the Church, to which these men *profess to belong*, teach? “All holy Scripture agreeably beareth witness that a *true lively faith in Christ* doth bring forth *good works.*”‡ And again, “This faith the holy Scripture teacheth; this is the strong rock and foundation of Christian religion,” and the 12th Article speaks of good works *as the fruits of faith*, which follow after Justification. Now if Justification be *by faith*, then there must be the *faith* FIRST, because the works follow after Justification as THE FRUITS OF THIS JUSTIFYING FAITH.

As the Theology of Puseyism differs from that of Scripture and the Church of England, on the preceding subject, *so also, and by necessary consequence on that most*

* 1st and 2d parts of Homily on Repentance.

† Tract 87, pp. 64, and 56.

‡ 4th Homily, 2d part, and 3d Homily.

important and essential doctrine, JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH. Puseyism stands OPPOSED TO THIS DOCTRINE as explained by Scripture and by our Church, because on the Puseyite scheme, Justification rests, in part at least, on works, and is the result of obedience on the part of man, whereas we find Scripture, and our own Church accordantly, teaching obedience and Christian holiness, AS THE FRUIT AND CONSEQUENCE OF JUSTIFICATION, of a justifying faith in Christ; the good fruit from the good tree.

That the above is not a false estimate of the doctrine at present under our investigation, the following extracts will abundantly prove. The 80th Tract before noticed, supplies some striking instances of the truth of what has been advanced.

“Fully to know that we are saved by faith in Christ only, and not by any works of our own, and that we can do nothing excepting by the grace of God, *is a great secret—the knowledge of which can only be attained by obedience as the crown and end of great holiness of life.*”*

The doctrine of salvation by faith in Christ, it will be observed, is admitted here in words, for to deny it would be a bold, and perhaps also an undesired step, and even a Papist would scarcely object to a statement, so clogged and encumbered as that in this extract. It is exactly reversing the Gospel order of things, which is faith in Christ first, and *holiness* as the necessary result of this influential and purifying faith. “Every man that hath *this hope in him* purifieth himself, even as he is pure.” It is they who have “*learned Christ,*” and “*have been taught by him,*” who *put off the old man, and being renewed in the spirit of their minds,* “put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.”† So also our Church teaches, “*We must set no good works before faith, nor think that before faith a man may do any good work.*” And “as men first have life, and

* Tract 80, p. 49.

† Eph. iv. 20—24.

after be nourished, *so must our faith in Christ go before, and after be nourished with good works.*"* But the Tractarian mode is to attain the knowledge that we are saved by faith in Christ, by our previous "*obedience—as the crown and end of great holiness of life.*" The Bible speaks of no principle which can produce this holiness, but only the faith in Christ, which our author says, is *to come afterwards*, as the crown of great holiness! Who that knows any thing of the Puseyite writings, will not be aware also of the meaning usually attached to *holiness of life*, as implying the observance of the ceremonies and outward forms merely of religion, and of the undue stress laid upon them as if *in themselves* efficacious. Who can have failed to remark the manner in which these, and similar external acts, are pressed as a kind of *semi-expiatory penance*, and then speciously termed self-denial, and mortification of sin, but *so far as they partake this false principle*, tending directly to subvert the Atonement of Christ, at least as a perfect, and *sufficient expiation* for sin. An example or two on this head may be needful.

"All religious worship must be the spontaneous act of the individual, *and the more inconvenience, or self-denial such an act is accompanied with*, the more does it partake of the nature of such spontaneous action."†

[How ought every act of religious worship, whether public or private, to be felt and considered—as a high and sacred privilege, *or as penance and self-denial?* And which estimate ought to be *inculcated?*] Again,

"*As long as we do what we like best, whether it be in religion, or in any thing else, it is evident we give no proof of our having any of the spirit of true religion abiding in us.*"‡

* Homily V. On good works.

† Tract 80, p. 70. "This was commonly the *penance* that Christ enjoined sinners, '*Go thy way and sin no more.*'" Homily on Repentance.

‡ Plain Sermons, xxxvi. p. 327.

We shall *like best* whatever our hearts and affections are most engaged in, and if this be the service of God, we give *the very best proof*, instead of none at all, “of our having the spirit of true religion,” when “*we do what we like best.*” But the mistaken theology of the Tractarian school, taking as a guide the self-imposed penances and asceticism, of an early corruption of Christianity, loses sight of that principle of love, which makes religion not less a matter of choice and privilege, than of duty; and no occasion is unhappily lost, of depreciating the importance and the reality, of the joys and consolations of a religious life, and of representing them as unwarranted by Scripture, and to be therefore rather met with the language of cold discouragement. *And why is this?* Because it is the natural religion of the heart of man, to cling in one form or other, to the *merit of his actions*, and to self-inflicted and unauthorized pain and penance, *as a satisfaction for sin*, “which things have indeed *a show of wisdom* in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body,”* and which we accordingly find, *as a principle of atonement for sin*, in all false religions of every age and country. And now, having seen something of their ideas of penance, how do we find the Puseyite teachers, treating the subject of the peace and joy and gladness, of religion?

“Scripture does not set before us any sensible *joy or satisfaction to be sought for as the end of holiness.*”†

Let Scripture speak in answer to this most unfounded allegation, “*The joy of the Lord is your strength.*” “The God of Hope fill you *with all joy and peace in believing.*” “*The fruit of the Spirit* is love, joy, peace.” “*And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.*”

“*Whether in this world a man can have a full and positive assurance of final acceptance*” is declared to be among

* Col. ii. 23.

† Tract 80, p. 82.

“the subjects about which *God has not thought fit to give clear, if any, intimation, and which no Christian need trouble himself about.*”*

Not “*trouble himself*” about his “*final acceptance!*” “What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?” And is he *not to trouble himself*, whether his soul shall be saved or lost? St. Paul teaches Timothy, that the Holy Scriptures were able to make him “wise unto salvation,” and surely the Bible was given for this very end of shewing us the way of salvation. And is that way left in such obscurity, that we cannot ascertain whether we are in the right way, or not, for the attainment of the end? This uncertainty about salvation, this doubting of the promises of God, as if they were secret things and unrevealed, has ever been, as we know, as much a tenet of Popery as of Puseyism, but *does Scripture* give it any countenance? *Is it true* that “God has not thought fit, to give clear, if any, intimation,” as to whether we can have “assurance of final acceptance?” St. John gives as *the reason* for his Epistle, “These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, *that ye may know that ye have eternal life.*”† Our blessed Lord continually promises in the plainest and fullest manner, eternal life to those who believe in Him. “*Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.*” “He that believeth on me *hath everlasting life.*” “My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: *And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.*”‡

The epistles are full of the strongest encouragements to rest upon God, as a God of love in Christ, for the fulfilment of all the glorious promises for the everlasting safety and happiness, and the accomplishment of the salvation, of every humble believer in the Saviour of sinners, aiming to shew the sincerity of that belief, as it must,

* Plain Sermons, iii. p. 23.

† 1 John v. 13.

‡ John vi. 37, 47; x. 27, 28.

and ever will be shewn, in the grateful, affectionate obedience, of a holy and heavenly walk and conversation. But this happy assurance of acceptance through Christ, taught in the Bible, and so evidently enjoyed by the primitive Christians in apostolic times; the “*rejoicing with joy unspeakable and full of glory*,” in the “lively hope” of the “inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away;”—all this, is with the Puseyite divines, “the modern heresy of final perseverance,”—the “modern figment of indefectible grace.” Yet St. Paul declares, that “if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable,” and if *no sure and certain* hope in Christ for the next life, be attainable, then to the extent of this uncertainty, we are involved in this “most miserable” state. But St. Paul and his fellow-labourers, taught by the Holy Ghost, were themselves persuaded, and left on record for us the same triumphant and glorious truth, that neither death, nor life, things present or things to come, should “be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”*

To return from this digression to the more immediate subject of discussion—the Puseyite statements on faith. It will be remembered that in some former extracts, particular reference was made to self-denial, as connected with penance. One is now added as illustrating this view.

“It will always be true of human nature, *that it cannot approach God without a sacrifice.*”†

Assuredly there must be the sacrifice of self-will, and

* Rom. viii. 35—39.

Is not the following passage in direct and plain opposition to the whole of the above Scripture testimony? “Let no man expect too much, either of spiritual joy, *or of quiet and peace in believing*—Let him not while this world lasts, *look for that clear knowledge of saving doctrines*, which may be fitly compared to *light*.” Plain Sermons, xxix. p. 269. [What are the words of Jesus? “*He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.*” John viii. 12.]

† Tract 80, p. 70.

an unreserved submission of the heart to God; but how this is to be produced is the very point at issue. *The sacrifice* without which fallen human nature cannot approach God, was that ‘full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice’ made on the cross by Jesus Christ. *Self-righteousness* will try to make one for itself. Christian *self-renunciation* will “count all things but loss,” to “win Christ and be found in him,” and so take up the cross and follow him, with that true self-denial and crucifixion to sin and to the world, *only to be found as a principle of love*;—“I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me,” is St. Paul’s exposition of the subject.* But then Paul preached justification “by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law,” and *only as possessors of this faith*, can we die to sin and live unto God.† So *only will the world be crucified to us, and we unto the world*. But if this only foundation of sanctification be that which, according to Puseyism, it is “dangerous” to lay—that which ought to be kept back and concealed, *on what can a Christian life and conduct be built?*

The writer of the 71st ‘Tract for the Times,’ gives‡ as a specimen of “perverse interpretation, the popular sense put upon the *Eleventh Article*,” which he professes to consider, “clearly and soundly explained in the Homily on Justification or Salvation—now so associated in the minds of many with this wrong interpretation, as to render almost hopeless the recovery of the true meaning.”

Let us trust that it is hopeless for the Puseyites to associate *their* meaning with it, this “popular sense,” and “wrong interpretation,” being in reality, the true and simple meaning of this important Article. “We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our

* See Gal. ii. 16—20.

† Rom. v. vi.

‡ Page 32.

*own works and deservings,” &c.** While yet *professing* Churchmen, this Article cannot be directly denied, but the subterfuge is to attach *another meaning*, and so explain away the true one, which is the ultra-protestantism, scoffed at by these servile copyists of a pseudo-antiquity. The *sincerity* of a *profession of agreement*, in the doctrine of the Homily on Salvation, as explaining the Article, may be appreciated in those who descant on *the impropriety and the danger*, of preaching the Atonement indiscriminately to all, for it is there so preached, and most faithfully and fully set forth, as the cause of that free “justification or righteousness, which we receive of God’s mercy and Christ’s merits, embraced by faith, taken, accepted, and allowed of God, *for our perfect and full justification.*”†

* Article XI. It should not escape observation in connection with this Article, that to deny the doctrine of *imputed righteousness*, and yet *admit the Article*, is merely disputing for words, a hair-splitting distinction without a difference. For if “we are *accounted righteous* before God, *only for the merit* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and *not for our own works and deservings,” but for his*, it follows, that *the righteousness of Christ*, is that on account of which, we are accepted as righteous in God’s sight. In other words, his righteousness is imputed, made over to us, “by faith”—accounted ours, so that we are “accepted in the beloved.” “He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin.” And why? “*That we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*” “By the obedience of one shall many *be made righteous.*” “*The righteousness of God* which is by faith of Jesus Christ, *unto all and upon all them that believe.*” It was this “*righteousness which is of God by faith,*” which St. Paul desired in renouncing his own.‡ The Homily on Salvation thus expresses the same truth. “*Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly do believe in Him.* He for them paid their ransom by his death. He for them fulfilled the law in his life. So that now in him, and by him, every true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the law.”§ Bishop Beveridge thus states his own faith on this subject. “I look upon all my righteousnesses but as filthy rags; and it is in the robes only of the righteousness of the Son of God, that I dare appear before the majesty of heaven.”

† Homily III.

‡ 2 Cor. v. 21. Rom. v. 19. iii. 22. Philip. iii. 9.

§ Third Homily—close of part 1st.‡

Complaint is further made that the “popular teaching” above alluded to, “*has practically made a separation between the doctrines of Justification and Sanctification.*” Certainly the Puseyite teaching *will not* do so, for in this creed these doctrines are mixed together. We have already seen that this teaching does not consist, in preaching “the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, *Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins.*” It is adjudged “*dangerous*” to declare these blessed and saving truths, free justification through the blood and righteousness of Jesus Christ, and Sanctification *as resulting from it*; and therefore, on account of this “exceeding danger,” as it is elsewhere called, of Puseyite imagination, the knowledge of salvation by faith in Christ, (being a truth which “*is in fact the very secret of the Lord, so far from its being what is supposed,*”)* is to be revealed only to those who are *worthy*, who have acquired by previous holiness, a worthiness and meetness for it, for it is said to be attained, only “*as the crown and end of great holiness of life.*”† The consequences of this confusing together of Justification and Sanctification, it is important to mark, because it has ever been a fruitful source of Popish error, and of *Protestant Popery*. If Justification be not distinctly kept in view *as the principle*, and Sanctification *as its consequence*, then Justification becomes *dependent upon Sanctification*, and must, in part at least, be our own work, and not the work of Christ for us. And this is to overthrow altogether, that doctrine

* Tract 80, p. 76.

† It may be well to mark again the dissentient doctrine of our Church, from that of Puseyism on this subject “*of works before justification,*” as explained in the 13th Article. “Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, *forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or as the school authors say, deserve grace of congruity*: yea, rather for that they are not done as God willed and commanded them to be done, *we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.*”

pervading every part of the gospel revelation;—"By GRACE are ye saved through faith."*

Frequent reference has been already made to the "PLAIN SERMONS, by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times." (Vol. i. 1839.) Some further extracts from this volume, which the writer of these Sketches has carefully examined throughout, will be found to throw additional light upon the views which have been considered. *In a course of thirty-six Sermons*, by various writers of the Tracts, it will be judged reasonable to expect to find, if any where, the doctrines and the character of the preaching, fairly developed. And more especially can no objection be made to this testimony, as these Sermons are put forth, *professing to carry out more fully the design of the "Tracts for the Times,"* and to shew that these Tracts,

"Were not set forth as mere parts of ideal systems, or themes for disputation....but rather urged as truths of immediate and essential importance...means of continual resource and consolation in life, and of calm and sure hope in death."†

And what then do we find presented in these Sermons, as the "*means of continual resource and consolation in life?*" What is to teach the "*calm and sure hope in death?*" The only answer which can be given is—*our own works*. This may seem strong language, but it is warranted.

The second of these Sermons, is on "The Certainty of Judgment." It might be supposed that the way of salvation through present faith in "the Lamb of God," would be pointed out, and the Refuge in Him, as the unfailing defence of his people in "the great day of his

* The Homily on Salvation establishes this point with admirable clearness and precision. "*Justification is the office of God only, and is not a thing which we render unto him, but which we take of him,*" excluding works therefore in the matter of Justification, and it is expressly said that faith "*shutteth them out from the office of justifying.*"

† Preface to the "Plain Sermons." It will be in the recollection of the reader, that a "*sure hope in death,*" a *certainty of final acceptance,* is pronounced in these very Sermons to be *unattainable.*

wrath" upon his enemies. But the Sermon contains *no reference to any thing*, but that we shall be saved or lost *by our works*. Beyond all doubt we are to be judged *according to our works*, for so the Bible plainly tells us, and that they are the evidences of our having a living faith at all, for that is no true faith which does not bear the fruits. But faith in Christ must precede these fruits, and it is on system kept back in these discourses. The 87th Tract elucidates the motive for this style of preaching as follows.

"Religious doctrines and articles of faith can only be received according to certain dispositions of the heart; *these dispositions can only be formed by a repetition of certain actions.*"

This fallacy of teaching good works *as a preparation* for faith, has been already noticed. The 4th Homily opens thus, 'The *first coming* unto God, is through faith.' Then the works, 'As the light cannot be hid, so *a true faith will shew itself by good works.*'

The Writer then insists that

"He who preaches the judgment, recommends alms and fasting, impresses most the shortness of life, or any such practical appeals, will lead men most to pray, *though he may not repeat in express words the necessity of aid from the Holy Spirit.*"

And the same argument is used to give the idea *that Christ may be preached without naming his Atonement*,* or as expressed a few pages previously, *that it may be truly and effectually preached, "by one who might have even never prominently and explicitly declared it."*† It is mere mockery thus jesuitically to affect to admit in words, doctrines which in practice, are thrust out of sight, excluded under these false pretences from the teaching, and so rendered altogether nugatory. To such sentiments, the strongest condemnation alone is either applicable or suitable, for it is no occasion on which to speak

* Tract 87, pp. 58, 59.

† Tract 87, p. 54.

‘smooth things,’ when our Lord is thus as it were, betrayed with a kiss, and by his professing friends.

In the *Sermon on “Religious Peace,”* we are said to attain and possess it, simply on the ground of our own obedience. Not only is there no reference to Christ as “our peace,”* or to that sweet peace in our hearts, arising from a sense of pardon and reconciliation with God, by faith in his Son, but this last is altogether repudiated as a matter of mere fanciful feeling and delusion.

The 22nd Sermon, professing to describe *true faith* from the example of Abraham, asserts that he was selected from all others *on account* of his faith and other graces; and in the next page states that it was not “from mere arbitrary choice, or for some hidden reason, but because he was eminently good and holy, self-denying and resigned.” The summing up is as follows :

“You see then that true faith, such as Abraham practised, and such as God will accept through the blood of Jesus Christ, consists in a self-denying life ; to speak shortly, self-denial is the real test of faith.”†

True Christian self-denial, will most certainly be found as a fruit and test of living faith, but this Sermon, professedly explaining Christian faith, does not contain a syllable about faith in Christ, or about believing in Him at all. Puseyite pulpit instruction excludes this *on system*, and though it is cause enough for reprehension and sorrow, it can excite no surprise, for it has been shewn in the preceding pages to be *the principle* acted upon and advocated. Another definition of faith occurs, which will be further explanatory.

“They will be justified by faith, i.e. by the free and undeserved mercy of God in Christ Jesus, accepting their faith as if it were perfect obedience, yet in another sense, they are justified by the works of the gospel law, not by faith only, that is, God graciously accepts their good meaning proved by their works,

* Eph. ii. 13, 14.

† P. 192.

*as the proper condition on which he vouchsafes to pardon them, and make and keep them members of his Son our Lord.”**

We do not read in Scripture of “*our good meaning proved by our works, as a condition of pardon,*” but that *being pardoned*, and “*made nigh by the blood of Christ,*” the principle of sanctification is also imparted, enabling the renewed nature to bring forth those “*fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ to the glory and praise of God.*” And further, it is thus only that we can *be made and kept members of Christ*. It is not our “*good meaning proved by our works,*” that can make us such, because “*the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine,*” and we must be members of Christ, spiritually united to him by faith, (not merely nominally such as baptized in his name) before we can bear the fruit. “We have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.”† The Sermon thus continues,

“This faith, *like all other good habits*, is, under God’s Holy Spirit, *the result of continual good works . . .* and God, *by it*, makes us *worthy, and reckons us worthy*, of his kingdom.”

Scripture, and in accordance with it, the Church of England, make faith “the gift of God,” not a good “*habit* ;” nor yet “*the result of good works,*” as above asserted, but the good works *the result of faith*.‡ Neither do we learn from the Bible, that *our faith* makes us *worthy of heaven*. If so, how do we need a Saviour?

* Sermon xxxv. p. 224.

† Article X.

‡ “Good works go not before in him which shall afterward be justified, but good works do follow after, when a man is first justified.” Augustine, as quoted in the 16th Homily (On Fasting.) The 12th article explains, that “Good works do spring out necessarily *of a true and lively faith*, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.”

As connected with the subject of conversion, the following passages, out of many others, may be instanced.

“There is not one word as though the Judge to please himself . . . took out here one, and there another, to be endowed with faith, and finally saved, whether themselves will or no.” And again, “not at all converting and compelling them whether they will or no.”*

Not against their will certainly, because God makes his ‘people *willing* in the day of his power.’ “God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation *through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth.*” Thus it is, by renewing the will, and changing the heart,† that the people of God, as “his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works,” are enabled *willingly*, and not against their will, to receive the Saviour freely offered in the gospel, and knowing that they are not their own, but bought with a price, to glorify God in their body and in their spirit which are God’s.

“Let us fear,” the writer adds, “*lest so much depending, as plainly does depend, on our own works*, those works be found at the last day to be nothing, or next to nothing.”

Surely this is most objectionable language, and far better calculated to instil a pharisaic, self-righteous dependence upon ourselves than any thing else. We shall never arrive at true Christian holiness of heart and life, but on the gospel principle of love to Him “who gave

* Sermon iii. p. 21.

† “I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh.” Ezek. xxxvi. 26. “*I will put my laws into their mind and write them in their hearts.*” Heb. viii. 10.

As a professing Churchman, the 17th Article ought to be authority with our Author, and the contradiction between the Sermon and the Article is glaring enough. As also that between the Article and the following. “God having put it in our power to choose for ourselves, *leaves us to ourselves* to make the choice.” Sermon xvi. p. 136. Certainly the fatal choice which we should all make, *if left to ourselves*, is our own fault, through the love of sin; but it is by grace alone that any obey the call of God, and are turned “from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.”

himself for us." It is in vain to teach any other way than that which God has marked out in his word. It is "*the grace of God that bringeth salvation,*" which alone can teach us, to "live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world," and make it our aim and desire to "adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things."*

In the 14th Sermon,† the doctrine is condemned which is stated to prevail,

concerning "the Christian character being formed at once,‡ by some fancied operation of the Holy Spirit on the soul, *working a miraculous change which is felt in the heart, and making the person from that time forward an altered character, A NEW CREATURE.*"

Yet, "*if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away, and all things are become new.*"§ Would the caution be needless, in the case of this Instructor of others, to beware lest haply he "be found even to fight against God?"

It should be observed that these views respecting the non-necessity of conversion, necessarily follow on the adoption of such sentiments as the following, on Baptism.

"All therefore who have been made whole by baptism."|| "I speak especially to those *who have not yet stained their baptismal robe* with any gross wilful sin, or habit of sinful indulgence."¶ "First, regenerating grace comes by holy baptism, *whereby as Infants, being once for all made partakers of the atoning blood of our Redeemer, and sanctified by his Holy Spirit, we need afterwards, from time to time, only supplies and*

* Tit. ii. 11—14.

† P. 122.

‡ The writer ought to know that *the Christian character being formed at once*, is not the view maintained by those on the evangelical side, who oppose the unscriptural and Antinomian idea, that there is no progressive sanctification—no growth in grace. •

§ 2 Cor. v. 17.

|| Sermon xi. p. 94.

¶ Sermon xii. p. 107.

*renewals of the same grace,** which supplies are said to be afforded by Confirmation, prayer, fasting, and most of all the holy Eucharist.† Once more, “some good space of time, some regular practice of holy desires—and just works, must be generally necessary, *before you can be duly clad with the wedding-garment, the robe of holiness, which God in his mercy threw over you in holy Baptism*, but which you too often by your unworthy behaviour, have more or less thrown off.”‡

Let the message to the Laodicean Church be seriously pondered in reply to the foregoing. “Because thou sayest, *I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing, and knowest not that thou art wretched, and*

* *The necessity of any change of heart*, but that which is assumed to take place invariably in baptism, is here, it will be remarked, formally denied. In Tract 86, p. 5, we are said “*to have received from the Church, our Spiritual Birth in one Sacrament, and the bread of life in the other.*”

† Sermon xxiv. p. 214.

‡ xxv. p. 225. The same Sermon speaks of “the sentence pronounced in holy Scripture against those who fall into deadly sin, *after being delivered from sin by holy baptism.*”

The following extract is from the Sermons of Mr. Newman, pp. 101, 2, as quoted by Dr. Pusey. “We believe this—that He (Christ) *at our baptism* spoke over each of us the word of acceptance, and admitted us at once to his presence, by the same word forthwith proceeded to realize his gracious purpose; that his word ran very swiftly—‘*sharper than any two-edged sword;*’ that it reached even to our hearts, conveying its virtue to our nature, *making us what the Almighty Father can delight in,*” [making the Almighty Father delight, one trembles to write it, in the unholy lives, because unrenewed natures, of millions of baptized and nominal Christians] “and so returning to him ‘*not void,*’ *but laden with the triumphs of his grace, the fruits of righteousness in us, ‘spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.’*”

[According to this theory, all are justified at baptism, and all then experience this regenerating change, and need no further conversion, and thousands, and tens of thousands in every age, have been deluded by the same belief, to their everlasting perdition. Can it be said by any stretch of charity, that the fruits brought forth by the generality of baptized persons, are “*fruits of righteousness,*” the necessary result, it must be remembered, of regeneration and renewal of the heart, *where really found?*—]

miserable, and poor, and blind and naked; I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed." "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick," and only such will come to Christ, and feeling their own sinfulness and spiritual poverty, thankfully accept *his righteousness* as their '*robe of holiness*' in the sight of God, and so "*be made the righteousness of God in Him.*" Let us also remember who has said, "to whom much is given, the same loveth much." They only who know *how much has been forgiven them*, will feel the force of the exhortation, "I beseech you that ye walk *worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.*"

One additional extract must close these notices of the "Plain Sermons," published on their own shewing, as specimens of the instruction judged most suitable, by the Authors of the "Tracts for the Times," to afford "continual consolation in life, and calm and sure hope in death."*

"*Would you know the true Gospel?*—know something as the Saints know it, of the way of Salvation."

[Let the *way of Salvation*, as alleged here, and this *true gospel*, be marked. "It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." "*Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,*" is his own most gracious invitation, and unchanging promise. Is this coming to Christ, this faith in Him, the way of Salvation here proposed?]

"You must begin by denying yourself," says this teacher, "Christ crucified† is the Corner Stone, *the foundation of the building of true faith*, that is, not simply believing that he died

* Preface.

† We have previously seen that it is *not Christ crucified for us*, but our being crucified to sin, as *a preparation for faith in Christ*, to make us worthy to attain this faith, to which Puseyism refers the expression, "Christ crucified."

for you, and trusting to be saved by his merits ; that in comparison is an easy kind of faith, and has been felt by many an impenitent sinner."

[Has been *professed* would more nearly resemble the truth. None have ever been really possessors of this faith, and (under the influence of the Holy Spirit convincing them of sin,) simply clinging to Christ, trusting to be saved by Him, through his atoning sacrifice, *as their Priest*, who have not, with equal sincerity, desired Him also *as a King*, reigning in their hearts, sanctifying their affections, and enabling them to devote themselves to his service, and to live to his glory.]

In closing these Sketches of Puseyite doctrine, its Socinian tendency should not escape notice on the one hand, any more than its Popish leaning on the other. The writers under examination can quarrel with the Socinianism of the American Abbot,* whose works have unhappily been so widely circulated in this country, and sufficiently Socinianized beyond all doubt his statements are, but our Puseyite opponents do not see apparently, that in systematically separating Christian practice from Christian doctrine—in preaching morality, and excluding *the principle* whence only it can spring, they are but following in Abbot's wake, teaching the Socinianism of good works acceptable to God, being the foundation instead of the superstructure—making holiness and a Christian life, independent of the faith in Christ which produces them, and even *a preparation of worthiness* on our part for the reception of the gospel, and the knowledge of the salvation which is in Jesus Christ. In short, we have the Anti-Christian absurdity of *the tree without a root*. The fruits of faith are expected without the faith itself, and without even the teaching of that faith. An outward conformity to the duties of religion may be thus produced, and it may be, in some cases, much apparent strictness and regularity of conduct. Something very

* See Tract 73.

closely *resembling* Christianity may appear as the result. But it will be as the dead men in Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones, after they "came together bone to his bone," "and the sinews, and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above, *but there was no breath in them.*" They were men indeed in form, *but life was wanting.* And what was needed? *The Spirit of God to give that life.* And this, spiritually considered, is the essential truth, rejected and denied by all who represent that those baptized persons, whose hearts are given to the world, and who are therefore living "according to the course of this world," are notwithstanding partakers of regenerating and renewing grace, and need no change of heart, no renewal of the will and affections, by the life-giving and sanctifying power of God the Holy Ghost.

CONNECTION OF VARIOUS SECTS AND HERESIES.

The Connection of various opposing Sects and Heresies with each other, both in ancient and modern times, is a subject of curious and instructive investigation. Our limits admit here, only of marking out the connections on a few points, and principally those of some of the more modern sects and parties.

And first as respects THE EVIDENCES OF TRUTH.

The Romanist deprecates enquiry, and demands implicit submission to the teaching and decisions of *the Church*, depreciating the value, exaggerating the difficulty, and discouraging the search into evidence.

The Puseyite joins in the cry, and denies the right and liberty of private judgment with the Papist. Both feel that the ground on which they stand would not bear the test of Scripture, unless *as interpreted by the corruptions* of former ages, and both therefore enjoin unhesitating faith in what is mis-called the doctrine of the Church Catholic.

The Irvingite in like manner, requires faith without a reason for the trust, and calls investigation unbelief, as to the assumption of “the Gifts,” &c. by his sect.

And in every age, it has been the uniform mark of false religions, and corrupted Christianity, to shrink from the test of investigation, and in its place to substitute a blind submission to the dogmas of human teaching. We are taught in Scripture a very different spirit, and commanded to search it. We find the Bereans commended for diligently examining “whether those things were so,” and in many passages we are directed to prove and try our faith.

WITH REGARD TO THE SCRIPTURES, *how does the case stand?*

The Jews reject the New Testament.

The Continental Neologians, and their *English followers*, including many *Dissenters*, with *Dr. Pye Smith* unhappily at their head, deny the plenary Inspiration of the Bible, reject such books and passages as contravene their own opinions, and explain away Scripture miracles, &c.

The Socinian translates to suit his own views, and adopts such parts as he imagines not to contradict his sentiments.

The Irvingite, Campbellite, &c. add to the written Word what is prophesied and spoken by themselves, claiming this as the Voice of the Spirit, and thus *they succeed* in making void the Word of God.

The Papist adds Tradition, by which he receives and enforces the superstitious observances of Antiquity, and doctrines unknown to Scripture, as of equal weight and authority.

The Puseyite closely follows *the Papist* in this matter. And he copies *the Socinian* also, in keeping back Scripture doctrines, and making them non-essential,

and in setting the teaching of the Gospels against that of the Epistles.

Do not all these varying Sects *concur in adding to, or taking from* the Word of God, and render themselves amenable to the guilt and punishment denounced against such offenders?

THE DOCTRINE OF PERFECTION has been urged in many forms, and as comprising the assumption of an aspect of superior holiness and strictness of life. In more modern times, it has been a favourite tenet of the *Methodists*, the *Quakers*, the *Irvingites*, and the *Puseyites*, all maintaining it on different grounds, and with varying modifications, but meeting in the principle upheld.

The Papists also maintain it, as advocates of the superior sanctity of a monastic life, celibacy, asceticism, &c. and how closely do the *Puseyites* now approximate to these ideas. But the Papist is amenable to this doctrine on another ground. *His Church claims merit to spare*, a stock of superabundant merit to part with for money, in the shape of indulgences. Therefore *perfection* must be alleged to exist in some at least of the Romish Saints, or there would be no spare merits at the disposal of the Priests. All this gross corruption and falsehood on the part of the Papacy, has its origin in the corruption of the Scripture doctrine of the all-sufficient Atonement of the Cross; and whenever the mind is "corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ," on the vital subject of Justification solely by his blood, deadly errors will arise, and human merit, in one form or other, be advocated and substituted. And this brings us to the last point which will be touched upon in this brief survey, namely,

THE ATONEMENT (*as the ground of acceptance before God, as the only foundation of a sinner's hope.*)

The Socinian rejects the Atonement by denying the God-

head of Christ, thus depriving his sacrifice of its power and worth.

The Papist virtually sets aside the efficacy of the Atonement by superadding works, as part of his Justification in the sight of God, *his own works* and those of *others*, (supererogation) including the merits of saints departed. He adds Purgatory also, thus denying the *sufficiency* of the expiation of Jesus Christ.

The Puseyite subverts the doctrine of the Atonement by concealing it, and keeping back the truth, as not necessary, and not safe, to be indiscriminately preached, thus *not* making it *the foundation*, and refusing to declare Jesus Christ to be "*the way, the truth, and the life*," that God "*loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins*." And this involves the doctrine of human merit equally with the Papist, for it is not Justification solely by the blood of Christ that is taught, and our justification on this scheme, becomes in part *our own work*, dependent on our sanctification, instead of this last being the consequence of the first, according to Scripture, and the Church of England.

THE END.



